

RECEIVED

United States District Court
Northern District of California

SCANNED

CLERK, US DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DIST. OF CAL.

CASE No. 21-cv-09379-JCS
MOTION REQUEST FOR INJUNCTION FOR
SB1236 E-Verify A CALIFORNIA CONSTITUTION

Cornelius Lopes
Plaintiff

v.

Nancy Pelosi
Defendant



Nancy Pelosi in violation of California Executive Order N-33-20: Statewide Stay at Home Law 09-2020

There are literally millions of aliens within the jurisdiction of the United States. The Fifth Amendment, as well as, the Fourteenth Amendments, protects every one of these aliens in the United States from deprivation of life, liberty and property without due process of laws these holding can be found in *Wong Yang Sung v. McGrath*, 339 US, 33, 48-51, *Wong Wing v. United States*, 163 US, 228, 238, *Volunteer Fleet v. United States*, 282 U.S. 481, 489. Moreover, even one whose presence in this country who are illegal immigrants, or involuntary, or transitory, are entitled to constitutional protections, *Wong Yang Sung*; *Wong Wing*, supra and the fact that all persons, aliens, illegal immigrants and citizens alike are protected by the Due Process Clause but does not lead to the further conclusion that all aliens are entitled to enjoy all the advantages of citizenship or to the conclusion that all aliens must be placed in a single homogenous legal classification as "essential worker". In every Establishment Clause case the Supreme Court has reconciled the inescapable tension between the objective of preventing unnecessary intrusion of either the church or the state upon the other, and the reality that, this Court now faces in this complaint is that Nancy Pelosi is violation of section 274 (A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8) U.S.C. 1324 (a) which cases total separation of the two nationalities, by using the American Negro's tax dollars and federal benefits and giving them to illegal immigrants, which delivers the American Negro into peonage and Nancy Pelosi has committed treason and embezzlement.

In 2013 House Minority Democratic leadership Nancy Pelosi voted in the 113th Congress and voted for Legislation S.744 called the Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act 2013-2014. In Section 6, titled Comprehensive Immigration Reform Funds and under Expenditure plan and amounts and activities related to upgrading software and information technology necessary to transition from a voluntary E-Verify system to mandatory employment verification system under section 274A of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8) U.S.C. 1324 (a) within 5 years. In subsection (B), titled, Federal contractors. Federal contractors shall participate in the System as provided in the final rule relating to employment eligibility verification published in the Federal Register on November 14, 2008 (73 Fed. Reg. 67,651), or any similar subsequent regulation, for which purpose references to E-Verify in the final rule shall be construed to apply to the System. And in Section (e)(2) Transition procedures the Secretary shall continue to operate the E-Verify Program as described in section 403 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996. In subsection (B) titled, Transition to the system. Any employer who was participating in the E-Verify Program described in section 403

of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (division C of Public Law 104-208; 8 U.S.C. 1324a note), as in effect the minute before the date of the enactment of this Act, shall participate in the System described in section 274A(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended by subsection (a), to the same extent and in the same manner that the employer participated in such E-Verify Program. In section (3) titled Construction. The repeal made by paragraph (1) may not be construed to limit the authority of the Secretary to allow or continue to allow the participation in such System of employers who have participated in such E-Verify Program, as in effect on the minute before the date of the enactment of this Act. The Court must hold, on April 27, 2021, the United States citizens were not issued a minimum wage but when the Biden/Harris Administration issues a Presidential executive order to raise the minimum wage to \$13 for federal contractors which is exclusivity for illegal immigrants which interferes with California law subsection 11011 Affirmative Action the California constitution and Proposition 187 the American Negro's voter's approval of not allowing illegal immigrants work or social services. The Biden/Harris Administration also have violated Title II of the Patriot Act, which states that financial institutions must implement procedures to verify the identity of their customers and check their identities against lists of known or suspected terrorists. The Patriot Act's provisions require the creation and implementation of new anti-money laundering programs and creates potential criminal liability for institutions that are "willfully blind" to money-laundering taking place within their institutions. The conversion of my property is that it must be done with a serious intent of depriving plaintiff of his and the Negro races rights. The legislation set by Nancy Pelosi is to distribute the money to the nonprofits who Nancy Pelosi describe as partners of California. They in turn will distribute the money to the immigrants. Nancy Pelosi has created immigration policies and frauds that gives the illegal immigrants a separate budget line item on the California state budget to aligned with the CalFire Fire Protection budget. These separate but equal services are funded each year by the CalFire budget, which comes from state taxes and federal grants. As the state fire budget increases then automatically does the immigrant budget. As it increases it is aligned with the plaintiff tax dollars; as well as federal money which is given to California gets for reimbursement for the states fire suppression services, by the federal government. The plaintiff tax dollars are being used to pay for the existence of the illegal immigrant therefore, they or, nor were ever an 'essential worker' as SB54 proclaims. The illegal immigrant from Mexico and Central America owes it mere existence to the legislation above. Without the legislations above the illegal immigrant status of 'essential' becomes 'uselessness'. Therefore, Nancy Pelosi is in violation of California Constitution Employment Acceleration Act (SB 1236) also have violated Title II of the Patriot

Act, which states that financial institutions must implement procedures to verify the identity of their customers and check their identities against lists of known or suspected terrorists.

Nancy Pelosi segregates by prescribed rules with origins and purposes for one pathway to citizenship and for illegal immigrants and a separate pathway to minimizing and taking away rights of the plaintiff and Negro race. These causes are about a legislative body from the State of California and the Department of Homeland Security who uses its judicial tribunal, which is the state and federal police to accomplish and accommodate separate but equal paths for the American Negroes and illegal immigrants from Mexico and Central America. The Constitution's Framers believed that a bill, the Bill of Rights was appropriate for an unlimited government and the Tenth Amendment is truism today. The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, but are reserved to the States respectively, and to the people within those states. The question to the Court is, by the Tenth Amendment can a federal power be claimed by the defendant, through the Constitution? To formulate an answer, the Court needs to look at the enumerated powers, not the Tenth Amendment. In *Garcia v. San Antonio Metropolitan Transit Authority*, a narrow majority of the Supreme Court held, that a city was required to comply with federal labor laws, and that state sovereignty interests can be protected by the state's participation of the political process. As the complaint will show, Nancy Pelosi's legislative laws SB1236 and the other illegal immigrants California Constitutions AB1576, AB2779, SB1236, AB130, AB131, AB4, Post-Secondary non-resident scholarship, ABX1SBX1, AB236, AB1593, AB1024, SB54, SB1310, SB477, SB141, SB1159 and AB2792 are all unconstitutional as they violate the Fifth Amendment, as well as the Fourteenth Amendments. The questions now turn to whether the immigrant laws in California Legislation rely on the California "Bank" which is the State Budget is the fundamental principles of liberty and justice which lie at the base of all civil and political institutions? Whether these laws above are basic in the U.S. system of jurisprudence, and whether it is a fundamental right, essential to a fair trial of the plaintiff or the Negro race? For the Court to justify the state of California's creation of laws as stated above are for the immigrant community to exclude evidence and testimony that cannot be seized by the police, and it apply only to one race of people from a foreign land, is this constitutional? The Democratic National Committee created these California state law as an immigration "policy" and now they are used by the DNC to apply federally as H.R. 6800, H.R..98, H.R. 3697, HR.6, H.R. 2820, H.R. 4566 and therefore Americans Negro's in every state are paying for the illegal immigrants and American Negro's in every state are paying to educate, provide health care, provide food stamps and financial assistance to illegal immigrants on behalf of Mexico.

The E-Verify system is a free online system operated by the U.S. Citizen and Immigration Services (USCIS) and the Social Security Administration (SSA). E-Verify confirms an individual's identity and employment eligibility by comparing the information entered on the individual's I-9 form against records maintained in the SSA and USCIS databases. Once the information is entered into E-Verify, the system provides either of two results "Employment Authorized" or "Tentative no confirmation" (TNC). A TNC notification means that the information entered into E-Verify did not match the government databases. The Wetback Attorney General, DeLeon, created this unconstitutional legislation to achieve his Catholic, Protestant and Jews discussing religious beliefs, separate but equal. These are the same religions that allow them to become, state sponsored laws codifying the white man as a Homosexuals. Although, SB1236 was enacted in 2011, in 2012 it became unlawful in California for the state or a city, county, or special district to require an employer to use an electronic employment verification system, such as E-Verify. The electronic employment verification system, such as E-Verify. The CalFire, Heroes Act, and other federal money the state of California gets from the federal government is to hire illegal immigrants for jobs that are paid by federal dollars. Therefore, the purpose for SB1236 in case the illegal immigrants performing work under a federal contract, may be required by federal law to use E-Verify. The Court must hold, SB1236 violates California discrimination laws; California Fair Employment and Housing Act makes it illegal for an employer to discriminate because of race, religious creed, color, national origin, ancestry, physical disability, mental disability, medical condition, genetic information, marital status, sex, gender, gender identity, gender expression, age, sexual orientation, or military and veteran status of any person. California antidiscrimination law is often written or interpreted more broadly than federal law, especially in the areas of disability discrimination and sexual harassment. Nancy Pelosi authored, authorized or approved California's Constitution SB1236 that discriminates against Negro's because California's Constitution SB1236 discriminates in the workplace, education, housing, and false advertising. One reason for SB1236 is the lack of human intelligence of the Mexican and Central American; in Nancy Pelosi view affirmative action in light of varying poised levels of intellectual ability can be factors for the illegal treason's activities. It seems highly likely to the plaintiff genes and the Central American and Mexico environments have a lot to do with the race needed racial prefaces, CAFTA results in that region is a perfect example. DACA, SB54 and they both violate the plaintiff's Fourteenth Amendment rights, that no state should make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privilege and immunities of the citizen of the United States.

In S.744 "Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act" Section 214(c)(2) (8 U.S.C. 1184(c)(2)), as amended by sections 4302 and 4303, is further amended by adding at the end the following: (I) subsection (i) If the employer employs 50 or more employees in the United States, the sum of the number of such employees who are H-1B nonimmigrants plus the number of such employees who are L nonimmigrants may not exceed. "(I) 75 percent of the total number of employees, for fiscal year 2015; "(II) 65 percent of the total number of employees, for fiscal year 2016; and "(III) 50 percent of the total number of employees, for each fiscal year after fiscal year 2016. Subsection (ii) The term 'H-1B nonimmigrant' means an alien admitted as a nonimmigrant pursuant to section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b). The term 'L nonimmigrant' means an alien admitted as a nonimmigrant pursuant to section 101(a)(15)(L) to provide services to the alien's employer involving specialized knowledge. In determining the percentage of employees of an employer that are H-1B nonimmigrants or L non-immigrants under clause (i), an intending immigrant employee shall not count toward such percentage. At issue, the plaintiff and American Negro are citizen of the United States, a registered and qualified voter of the District of California whose interest are not being represented, through the delegation of his state or district, at the Democratic National Committee. The Court should see no reason to differentiate, for purposes of the standing requirement, between that interest, and the interest of one seeking representation in a state or national legislature. There is of course no doubt that in the latter context the plaintiff and the American Negro's claiming that their votes are diluted because Kevin DeLeon, Nancy Pelosi, Gavin Newsom, Maria Elena Durazo, Eloise Gomez Reyes, Janet Napolitano, Eleni Kounalakis, Xavier Becerra, Alex Padilla, Devin Nunes are representing with the American Negro's tax dollars illegal immigrants from Mexico and Central America. The California assembly, the California Legislature and the Trustees of the Sate College System of California represent illegal immigrants in Federal Courts. For example, in 2018 the Regents of University of California v. DHS and the State of California files a Supreme Court brief in representing illegal immigrants for affirmative action laws for illegal immigrants; and in 2019 the Regents of University of California v. DHS and the State of California files a second Supreme Court representing illegal immigrants' affirmative laws for education and every state(s) health and food stamp benefits.

The Issue did Nancy Pelosi as some old Aryan lady representing California and Kevin DeLeon in his official capacity as Senator of California and Xavier Becerra in his official capacity as Attorney General of California and did Gavin Newsom as Governor of California author and California Constitution by repealing E-Verify Employment Acceleration Act (SB 1236), unconstitutionally interfere with congressional powers by establishing a state employment agency then acting as a bank is unconstitutional because the Constitution does not provide a textual commitment for a state government to charter a bank. The State of California is under the Constitution and the establishment of a worker's union which California's Constitution SB1236 does and violates Section 8 (a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act of 1968. The State of California is under the Constitution and have established a "Bank" within the California State Budget in which the defendant Nancy Pelosi pay salaries, utility bill and even allowances in the form of \$500 to \$2500 a month to illegal immigrants. Similarly, assembly member Gonzales stated, The Latino Caucus has worked hard to make sure this community is prioritized in this year's budget, and I am proud of that work reflected in the joint agreement announced today between the Assembly and Senate, KQED News. Nancy Pelosi E-Verify Employment Acceleration Act (SB 1236) is the establishment of a bank and the Court will agree among the enumerated powers of the California government, the Court will not find the word 'bank,' but will find the great powers to lay and collect taxes; to borrow money; to regulate commerce Let the end be legitimate, let it be within the scope of the constitution, and all means which are appropriate, which are plainly adapted to that end, which are not prohibited, but consist with the letter and spirit of the constitution, are constitutional. Further, the Court must rule that California cannot tax the American citizen and discriminate their taxes to illegal immigrants as a bank, they do not take out payroll taxes, they do not take out federal taxes as they discriminate the American tax to illegal immigrants as payroll. That the power to tax involves the power to destroy. If the states may tax one instrument, employed by the federal government in the execution of its powers, they may tax any and every other instrument This was not intended by the American people. They did not design to make their government dependent on the states. The plaintiff asks the Court to the limited powers of Nancy Pelosi in the Articles of Confederation which allows the states to retain all powers not "expressly" given to the federal government and that California cannot tax the national bank nor its citizens and uses those taxes as payroll of illegal immigrants. The Court must hold, Nancy Pelosi's SB1236 California Constitution is in violation of Article I, Section 8. The "Necessary and Proper" Clause gave Congress the power to establish a national bank. The Tenth Amendment also gives this Court the authority to find SB1236 unconstitutional, as the work "expressly" is not included in the Tenth Amendment which is evidence

that the Constitution did not limit Congress to doing only those things specifically listed in Article I, therefore, the Court's authority is also in Article I, which the Court must hold SB1236 is unconstitutional.

The Court must agree, Kevin DeLeon, Nancy Pelosi, Gavin Newsom, Maria Elena Durazo, Eloise Gomez Reyes, Janet Napolitano, Eleni Kounalakis, Xavier Becerra, Alex Padilla, Devin Nunes, Democratic National Committee lack of State authority to create California's immigration "policy" which is their operational decisions although there are pre-existing federal immigration laws displaces room that otherwise would have exists for government discretion and immunity. Here the issue is of the liability of the Democratic National Committee, Kevin DeLeon, Nancy Pelosi, Gavin Newsom, Maria Elena Durazo, Eloise Gomez Reyes, Janet Napolitano, Eleni Kounalakis, Xavier Becerra, Alex Padilla, Devin Nunes must be considered by this Court in light of their dual capture and release policies for illegal immigrants and kill policies for American Negro's their laws are two different California Constitutions for two races of a people for the same crimes. The issue is also the plaintiff and American Negro's rights to benefit from their vote and representation by the government in which they voted for in the 2020 election but it appears this is only for "*DREAMERS*" who have "*HOPE*" of not being deported since their parent have no "*essential worker*" skills which means Nancy Pelosi is legally held to S.744 Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act they are in violation of section (E) Expenditure Plan, subsection (xv) to transition from a voluntary E-Verify system to mandatory employment verification system under section 274A of the Immigration and Nationality Act. The Court must recognize that because the defendant authorized a California's Constitution SB1236 unconstitutionally overbroad and contravene the First Amendment in that the defendant exclude American citizens but includes private groups who are illegal immigrants for SB1236 to reach, together with the commonly used "policy" towards a private group, establish that SB1236, as currently construed, does create an unacceptable risk to the substantial amount of protected conduct that the American Negroes have to their vote benefits and ballot requirements of representation by Nancy Pelosi. For California Constitutions that segregate by characteristics for work and continues to be a major factors in the California workplace as the illegal immigrants as they are education and skill less are unitized with mythical skills such as the "*DREAMERS*" who have "*HOPE*" of not being deported since their parent have no "*essential worker*" skills or education as Nancy Pelosi concentration in lower paying segregated workforce which accounts for most of the wage differentials between illegal immigrants and American citizens. For example, in *United Farm Workers v. The United States Department of Labor*, case#20-cv-01690 illegal immigrants went to the Supreme

Court sued the very department who is already giving them money in S.53, H.R. 1319, H.R. 4502, H.R. 5515, H.R. 5523 in each of these federal laws the department of labor is either funding, illegal immigrant education, illegal immigrant purchasing of homes, illegal immigrants wages, illegal immigrant healthcare which Nancy Pelosi authored and the presence if such laws by the elected officials whom they voted for are social inequalities created exclusively for the American Negro communities presupposes the existence of a class of people who Nancy Pelosi did and had deprived of their rights and place in perpetual servitude, created by city and state employees.

Another reason for the existence of the practice of slavery among American Negro's by city and state employees has been identified to be the fact that slavery is just one of the features that accompanied the rise and development of kingdoms and empires in all the known cultures and peoples of the world. Historical I am sure the Court will agree that wherever an empire existed, there is always the tendency to compete with one another negatively as well as to subjugate one another to one's own advantage and one known methods of achieving this in the history of mankind has remained the waging of wars with one another. For example, slaves especially of African origin already in Spain and Portugal in the 1420s was not enough for the much works on the plantations in Europe. Portugal and Spain had long established trade contacts with the Arab Muslim merchants since the early Middle Ages, who at this period were still in control of the trade on gold and slaves in Africa. But this time around, Portugal and Spain did not want to hang onto the Arab merchants for the supply of these West African labor force and other material products so as to have them as much as they could. Illegal immigrants from Mexico, Asia, and the Taliban in the current period are still in control of the trade on gold and slaves in the United States under the laws above and now federally, under, "Build Back Better" which is apartheid. Another serious factor that led to the establishment of the Transatlantic slave trade was the discovery of America by the Italian Christopher Columbus in 1492. Here in 2021 the Italian Nancy Pelosi establishment of the Transatlantic slave trade with the Enhanced Child Tax Credit, The Small Business Paid Leave Tax Act, The Affordable Health Care Insurance, Emergency Broadband Benefits, Employer Tax Credit, Economic Impact Payments and Enhanced Child Care which all these California Constitutions are only for illegal immigrants, which encourages segregation by those illegal immigrants who benefit from the American Negro's tax dollars.

Nancy Pelosi's dual systems may not extend so to embrace effects upon interstate commerce so indirect and remote that to embrace them, the two complex societies affected by the dual system does effectually obliterate the obligation between what

was a national immigration enforcement and terrorism agency into a completely different centralized governmental agency. An agent of proxy vote on state affairs for the state of California. Which violates the Enforcement Act of 1870, which made it a crime for a public officer and private person to obstruct the exercise of the right to vote. The Court must hold, Nancy Pelosi's actions are in violation of the plaintiff's rights as they are affecting the supervisions of the electoral process as it relates to the federal governments obligation to supervise the electoral process. With the 2020 election two and a half months away, the Court must find this complaint meets strict scrutiny standards. The U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement and Removal Operations (ERO), the (ERO) implementation memorandum expanded ICE's enforcement focus to include removable aliens who (1) have been convicted of any criminal offense; (2) have been charged with any criminal offense that has not been resolved; (3) have committed acts which constitute a chargeable criminal offense; (4) have engaged in fraud or willful misrepresentation in connection with any official matter before a governmental agency; (5) have abused any program related to receipt of public benefits; (6) are subject to a final order of removal but have not complied with their legal obligation to depart the United States; or (7) in the judgment of an immigration officer, otherwise pose a risk to public safety or national security. The Department continued to operate under the directive that classes or categories of removable aliens are not exempt from potential enforcement. The law is already in place to deal with illegal immigrants and creating a separate and unequal laws. In S. subsection 1980 (pt. 3), 8 U.S.C. § 47(3), 8 U.S.C.A. § 47 (3) text states, if two or more persons in any State or territory conspire, or go in disguise on the highway or on the premises of another, for the purpose of depriving, either directly or indirectly, and person or class of persons of the equal protection of the laws, or of equal privileges and immunities under the laws; or for the purpose of preventing or hindering the constituted authorities of any State or Territory from giving or securing to all persons within such State or Territory the equal protection of the laws; or if two or more persons conspire to prevent by force, intimidation, or threat, any citizen who is lawfully entitled to vote, from giving his support or advocacy in a legal manner, toward or in favor of the election of any lawfully qualified person as an elector for President or Vice-President, or as a Member of Congress of the United States; or to injure any citizen in person or property on account of such support or advocacy; in any case of conspiracy set forth in this section, if one or more persons engaged therein do, or cause to be done, any act in furtherance of the object of such conspiracy, whereby another is injured in his

person or property, or deprived of having and exercising any right or privilege of a citizen of the United States, the party so injured or deprived may have an action for the recovery of damages, occasioned by such injury or deprivation, against any one or more of the conspirators. Nancy Pelosi is in violation of S.subsection 1980 (pt. 3), 8 U.S.C. § 47(3), 8 U.S.C.A. subsection 47 (3).

Plaintiff does have standing to challenge the constitutionality of the apportionment scheme. *Baker v. Carr*, 369 U.S. 186, 204 208, 82 S.Ct. 691, 7 L.Ed.2d 663 (1962). Plaintiff argues that the formula as a whole deviate too far in favor of the less populous cities and counties where the illegal immigration is concentrated but the immigrants cannot vote, so they are not selecting their representatives, the Democratic National Committee has abandoned the plaintiff and the Negro race in California. Although illegal immigrants do not vote Nancy Pelosi legislations favor proportionality to electoral college representations, to total population which is of illegal immigrants, as well as the Democratic party support in past elections. The defendant's authors and sponsors of the California's legislations interest in immunity encompasses not merely whether it may be sued, but where it may be sued. *Pennhurst II*, 465 U.S., at 99. Thus, a State does not waive Eleventh Amendment immunity in federal courts merely by waiving sovereign immunity in its own courts.

Also, unlike federal law, coworkers who are not supervisors can be sued and held personally responsible for unlawful workplace harassment. State law on disability discrimination differs in several ways from the federal Americans with Disabilities Act. The state law has (1) broader definitions of physical disability, mental disability, and medical condition; (2) no requirement for a substantial limitation on a major life activity (a limitation is enough); and (3) limitation is determined without considering mitigating measures. The Department of Fair Employment and Housing in California is responsible for enforcing state laws that make it illegal to discriminate against a job applicant or employee. Categories listed on their website, <https://www.dfeh.ca.gov/employment/> are business practices that are discriminatory in California. (a) Advertising, (b) Application, screening and interviews., (c) Hiring, transferring or termination of the employee, (d) participation in employee organizations, (e) Working conditions. SB1236 is in violation by discriminating by The Department of Fair Employment and Housing employment standards, (a) Advertising, (b) Application, screening and interviews., (c) Hiring, transferring or termination of the employee, (d) participation in employee organizations, (e) Working conditions.

California Legislation, SB1236 is titled Employment Acceleration, Prohibits the state and local jurisdictions from requiring an employer to use E-Verify, California Constitution in 2011. Here SB1236 is a State of California order that Governor Newsom and Nancy Pelosi has attributes to a pretexting injury to the American Negro known as segregation, discrimination and workplace threats or other conditions, including when the illegal immigrants "employment acts as a trigger to produce symptoms" in the preexisting workplace injury of mental disease, mental health at work of their employees (police) to kill American Negro while working as a city or state employees but have a law not to kill ST1236 E-Verify system to mandatory employment verification system under section 274(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8) U.S.C. 1324 (a) or California Constitution SB54 gives immunity to the illegal immigrant and not to kill *(it)* which prohibits states and local law enforcements from investigate, interrogate, detain, detect, or arrest persons for immigration enforcement or AB2792 which prohibits a law enforcement official, as defined, from detaining an individual on the basis of a United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement hold or (SB 1310) which changes misdemeanor sentencing to a maximum of 364 days which is only for illegal immigrants convicted of crimes or (AB 263) which provides for illegal immigrants work workplace rights employer retaliation or (AB 4) which limits local jails from holding immigrants set a minimum standard across state to limit holds. Here, California Constitutions AB4, AB236, ST1310, AB2792, SB4 and SB1236 all involve Nancy Pelosi acting as a financial institution.

California Constituien SB1236 dealing with wages has lead to the following California Constitutional laws exclusly dealing with state wages and federal grants for illegal immigrants below are a few of Caifornia unconstitutional laws:

1. Undocumented immigrants have since been called "**Dreamers**" sponsored by 48 co-sponsors in the Senate and 152 in the House
2. Dream Act, **H.R. 2820**
3. **H.R. 2821**, the American Promise Act of 2019
4. **H.R. 6** would provide permanent legal status for Dreamers as well as beneficiaries of two humanitarian programs
5. **Temporary Protected Status (TPS)** and **Deferred Enforced Departure (DED)**
6. **SB 54** sanctuary state law
7. **One California** A total of \$30 million to assist the 2.44 million Californians eligible to become naturalized citizens and the 1.5 million residents eligible for deportation relief through the One California program administered by the state Department of Social Services.

8. **Medical Interpreters.** An allocation of \$3 million for a pilot program to provide professional interpreters for patients whose primary language is not English.
9. **Equal Access Fund.** An additional one-time allocation of \$5 million, for a total of \$15 million, to provide legal services to low-income California residents.
10. **Higher Education, Student Success.** A total of \$2.4 million to expand two Community College student success programs (Mesa and the Puente Project).
11. **CSU.** An ongoing allocation of \$12.5 million to increase enrollment at California State University by an additional 5,194 students. One-time \$35 million investment to improve graduation outcomes.
12. **Higher Education Diversity.** One-time allocation of \$2 million each to CSU, the University of California and California Community Colleges to support equal employment opportunity activities and faculty diversity reporting.
13. **Major Investments in K-12 Education.** A total of \$200 million in one-time funding to better prepare high school students for admission to college.
14. **SB141 Allows for UC Regents and Stanford University to accept illegal immigrants Higher Education Access and Affordability paid for by federal grants and they do not have to repay the loans back. Unlike American Negro's who have to pay for their education.**

From the unconstitutional benefits listed above the illegal immigrants are getting and paid for by the plaintiff taxes SB1236 covenants or conditions employment for illegal immigrants from Mexico and Central America from the Democratic National Committee, who have entered into is a work agreement with 2.4 million illegal immigrants; who have entered the United States on or after August 22, 1995. California Legislatures have been able to bargain for illegal immigrants, coerce private employers to hire them, allow them to unionize. For Example, Nancy Pelosi authored legislation SB1236 known as Employment Acceleration Act. This legislation prohibits the state and local jurisdictions from requiring an employer to use E-Verify. Therefore, Nancy Pelosi has lowered the threshold for employment in California, moreover, forcing American workers to compete alongside unskilled labor for the same or a lower wage. Once again, Nancy Pelosi has created a legislation so illegal immigrants can compete alongside the plaintiff and the Negro race, it them becomes the States immigration policy, which is dealing with the powers only delegated to Congress and the Courts. Therefore, this legislation is in violation of federal laws. The is uncompetitive disadvantages, the American has to an illegal immigrant was created, crafted in the halls of the Sacramento state government. The Court must hold, Nancy Pelosi's treason scheme created "jobs in American that American can't do". Which was her

political slogan in 2017, 2018, 2019 and in March she was on the Capital steps giving a speech about, immigration reform.

Legislation SB1236 is covenant that guarantees work and hence affecting the competition for that work for the plaintiff and Negro's in California. The Problem of Social Cost, 3 J. Law & Econ. 1 (1960) which represents nothing less than the beginning of modern or new law and economics. The law and economics can be found in SB54 legislation which has become a paternalistic thinking of Nancy Pelosi which has been so prominent from the start that SB54, is a covenant not to compete for the Negro in California for hiring an illegal immigrant for the same job. At this moment this future employee Negro (plaintiff) must make the decisions that will trigger the states covenants when applying for a jobs or tenure in company or salary increase which limits the set of choices the plaintiff and the Negro race has under legislation SB54 than under working conditions that existed in the state prior to SB54 legislation.

The current Social Cost of immigration on the plaintiff and the Negro race as a taxpayer is the Coase theory that is played out under Nancy Pelosi's legislation AB2279. Since 1998 Nancy Pelosi crated a scheme known as the Cash Assistance for immigrants. It is a state-funded program that provides monthly cash benefits to illegal immigrants in the amount of \$846 to \$1400 a month, which is free to them, but the plaintiff pays for them by his taxes, which is revenue for the defendant that comes from the General Fund. The theory all though reality is, an illegal undocumented immigrant from Mexico has arrived in California and needs a job. Joe the plumber who has just moved to California from Alaska because his wife, Sara said she can see California from her back porch in Alaska. Both men are not only looking for work, but the illegal immigrant is informed a program "only" for illegal immigrants will pay him \$846.00 a month for absolutely no legal reason. Joe is living off his savings and finds work based on his skills and educational level for \$1000.00 a month. The illegal immigrant also finds work for the same salary as Joe. The problem of social cost in this example is the illegal immigrant is being paid \$846.00 through legislation and this 'cash benefit' is 'only' for all illegal immigrants living in California. So, the social optimal solution is a non-equitable cost of \$846 is imposed on the entire population of California (plaintiff) forcing the taxpayers to pay for Nancy Pelosi's costs unilaterally, which allows the immigrants who are here illegally to over-charge the taxpayer ($\$846 - 1000 = \846) for their lifestyle. So (A) hurts (B) but (B) is forced to continue to pay for (A) lifestyle, though his taxes.

Similar to Hill v Mobile Auto Trim Inc., 725 S.W.2d 168, the Court held the non-competition agreement is a restraint on trade and is unreasonable and therefore reversed the judgment of the court of appeals, dissolve the temporary injunction,

and held the restrictive covenant in the franchise agreement void in all respects and the justices dissenting, affirmed the temporary injunction 704 S.W.2d 384. This Court must declare itself willing to enforce a noncompetitive covenant that SB54 has become. The SB54 legislation is the contract of the franchise or employer or incentivizing employers to hire immigrant workers of American Negro workers. The California Legislature created SB54, generally as a covenant to non-compete to but the taxpayer is paying for services not rendered to illegal immigrants, then as a worker the plaintiff, take it in the ass, by competing with unskilled labor of a race of people who are in the county illegally and they get the job for less pay or equal pay. The law, known as SB54 is an endeavor written by the California Legislature so the taxpayer cannot vote on legislation affecting funded that the taxpayer will not receive but the taxpayer taxes are used to allow Nancy Pelosi to receive votes on behalf of the taxpayer the plaintiff and the Negro race; then create legislation exclusively to allow illegal immigrants to receive state services which was obtained by a proxy vote taken by Nancy Pelosi on legislation affecting how the taxpayers taxes will be used on illegal immigrants who have entered the U.S. illegally. For Example, on January 20, 2020 instead of legislation for the American people and then there is "joe's" executive orders (1) Preserving and Fortifying Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA); (2) Reinstating Deferred Enforced Departure for Liberians; (3) Executive Order on the Revision of Civil Immigration Enforcement Policies and Priorities; (4) Memorandum: Review of and Interim Revision to Civil Immigration Enforcement and Removal Policies and Priorities; (5) Executive Order on the Establishment of Interagency Task Force on the Reunification of Families; (5) Executive Order Creating a Comprehensive Regional Framework to Address the Causes of Migration, to Manage Migration Throughout North and Central America, and to Provide Safe and Orderly Processing of Asylum Seekers at the United States Border; (6) Proclamation on the Termination of Emergency with Respect to the Southern Border of the United States and Redirection of Funds Diverted to Border Wall Construction; (7) DHS Statement on the Suspension of New Enrollments in the Migrant Protection Protocols Program (8) Executive Order on Restoring Faith in Our Legal Immigration Systems and Strengthening Integration and Inclusion Efforts for New Americans (9) Proclamation on Ending Discriminatory Bans on Entry to the United States (10) Executive Order on Rebuilding and Enhancing Programs to Resettle Refugees and Planning for the Impact of Climate Change on Migration (11) Executive Order on Ensuring a Lawful and Accurate Enumeration and Apportionment Pursuant to the Decennial Census (12) Regulatory Freeze Pending Review. The twelve-administration issued executive actions on immigration is for the benefit of one particular State, California. The executive orders allow for joining of unions and has a mandate of \$13 dollars an hour and a week later the

Pelosi and "Joe" indicated Congress will not pass the \$15 an hour minimum wage nationwide. The Court must hold the twelve executive orders on immigration listed above are unconstitutional as they involve state rights issues and Nancy Pelosi picking and choosing whom she wants to represent; as well as manipulation of the voting process and therefore Nancy Pelosi is guilty of treason on the American people and the United States of America and tax fraud.

The executive order, Preserving and Fortifying Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) deferred the removal of certain undocumented immigrants who were brought to the United States as children, have obeyed the law, and stayed in school. DACA and associated regulations permit eligible individuals who pass a background check to request temporary relief from removal and to apply for temporary work permits. SB1236 is California's Constitution and reflects a judgment that these immigrants should not be a priority for removal based on humanitarian concerns and other considerations and gives them work authorization, which is Nancy Pelosi's religious "policy" which is an operational decision which they are not immune from legal prostitution and liability. In section (ii) the functions of the Director of the Office of Management and Budget relating to budgetary, administrative, or legislative proposals. In section (b), states this memorandum shall be implemented consistent with applicable law. In section (c) states, this memorandum is not intended to, and does not, create any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law or in equity by any party against the United States, its departments, agencies, or entities, its officers, employees, or agents, or any other person. This is in violation of the Civil Rights Act, H.R. 2516 it violates racial discrimination in housing And Title I, for use of force or threats to interfere with the plaintiff and Negro races "federally protected activities", 18 U.S.C subsection 245. Title VII Sections 801-819 which prohibits discrimination because of race, color, religion and national origin in the sales or rental of housing. This memorandum is in violation of the plaintiff and the Negro races civil rights specifically, The Civil Rights Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 241) Title II Discrimination in Places of Public Accommodations 42 U.S.C. subsection 2000a plaintiff seeks injunctive relief against this memorandum, as it discriminates in public accommodations.

Here, California Constitution SB1236, prohibits the state and local jurisdictions from requiring an employer to use E-Verify and SB54, prohibits state and local law enforcement agencies, including school police and security departments, from investigate, interrogate, detain, detect or arrest persons for immigration enforcement; which coerces, justifies, mandates the city or state employee to enforce segregation in California by union members. Both intents of their legislations speaks only of discrimination... to encourage or discourage

membership in any labor organization and does not expressly limit the circumstances under which the discrimination is to come within the scope of the statutory language. The question then is, does the word as used without such qualification also mean nothing more than adverse treatment of employees? If it does, then any employer (defendant) do adversely treat their employees, including treatment that was not caused by employee exercise of Section 7 rights. Nancy Pelosi clearly "decimates" in the workplace, defined as, "discrimination" under 8 (a) (3) to mean any employer treatment of employees whether or not caused by employee exercise of Section 7 rights. And Congress may have achieved the desired limitation on the prohibitions of Section 8 (a) (3) by the requirement that such employer treatment of employees encourage or discourage membership in any labor organization. This is the view adopted by Justices Clark and Whittaker in their dissent in the Teamsters, Local 357 case. Therefore, the Court must hold, the word 'discrimination' in the section 8(a) (3), includes not only distinctions contingent upon 'the presence or absence of union membership, but all differences in treatment regardless of their basis. This is the 'cause' portion of subsection 8 (a) (3) which also includes an 'effect' clause which provides that the intended or inherent effect of the discrimination must be 'to encourage or discourage union membership.' Violations of this section are only those the effect of which is encouragement or discouragement of union membership. Cf. *Radio Officers v. Labor Board*, 347 U.S. 17, at 43. It must be clear to the Court the plaintiff has met the requirements of the section, both are present, therefore, Nancy Pelosi is guilty of an unfair labor practice.

In *Teamsters* which is similar to the complaints herein. In Local 357, the majority indicated that they understood "discrimination" as used in Section 8(a) (3) to require both that the employer adverse treatment of employees be caused by employee exercise of Section 7 rights and that it be differential treatment. Justice Douglas reasoned that a union secured discharge of an employee caused by his failure to use a union hiring hall was not "discrimination" because (1) the hiring hall agreement did not provide for differential treatment of employees on the basis of their union activities and (2) neither the employer nor the union differentiated between the discharged employee and other employees on the basis of union activities. In the case at bar, the employer (defendant) forces a private contract on a union member (police) who is already in a contractual obligation with their employer (city) and the laws created unconstitutionally for illegal immigrants is forced upon the police against the union members will. Given the facts, the Court must be outraged, if true, in the kinds of discrimination to which the legislations were able to accomplish. Here, Nancy Pelosi legislations and memorandums circumvent current state and federal laws so the illegal immigrants from Mexico can maintain legal status in the U.S. even though they have criminal record in their

countries; to assure that Nancy Pelosi created SB1236; SB45 and DACA stay in office by increasing the people who live in their districts. Their actions in these complaints raise state rights issues; the Court must render opinions on all the questions the plaintiff has asked in these complaints which are based on federal constitutional grounds pertaining to states' rights issues. Can a city employee, who is a member of a union offer immunity to a foreign national? Is Sanctuary City legislation California's endorsement of religion? Is Sanctuary City the State's motivation on religious grounds? Is sanctuary city being an evolution and creation teaching? Teaching of religion codified by the Sanctuary City law. The state rights issues are addressed the U.S. 9th Circuit of Appeals found that California has the right to refrain from assisting with federal efforts. Nancy Pelosi enacted SB1236; SB54 and DACA, for the sole purpose of endorsing prayer as a forced practice under state law and in schools, workplace and in public buildings and have included this religious belief in the California State Budget. Nancy Pelosi authored legislation SB1236 known as Employment Acceleration Act. This legislation prohibits the state and local jurisdictions from requiring an employer to use E-Verify for employment in California, moreover, forcing American workers to compete alongside unskilled labor for the same or a lower wage and causes is genocide by employees of the State of California. Once again Nancy Pelosi created legislations and gave her rebel yell, "there are jobs in American, American will not do" so illegal immigrants can compete alongside the plaintiff and the Negro race and take our jobs, housing and now legislative representation which is California's immigration policy and SB1236 a California law has those powers, only delegated to Congress and the Courts. Therefore, California Constitution SB1236 is unconstitutional.

Once again, the Court is called upon to consider the scope of the provision of the First Amendment to the United States Constitution which declares that Congress shall make no laws respecting an establishment of religion. Or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. Nancy Pelosi's SB1236 states, the California Values Act, also known as SB1236 is a local and state law which prohibit state and local law enforcement agencies, including police...from...investigating, interrogating, detaining, detect, or arrest persons for ...enforcing...activities or conduct in the connection with ...law enforcement agencies; enforcement authorities may not use resources, including personnel or facilities, to investigate or arrest people for federal immigration enforcement purposes. The Court must agree with the plaintiff that SB54 is invalid because the sole purpose is an effect on the part of the State of California to encourage a religious activity. Nancy Pelosi "discretion" in SB1236 to their employees have a no evidence of a secular purpose mandated by their employer. The advancing in religions motivation is in 7284.4. (a) (a) California law

enforcement agency means a state or local law enforcement agency, including school and the California Constitution SB54 provides for religious exercise during school day which contained no excusal provisions, therefore, is unconstitutional, by coercive upon those employees or citizens who did or do not want to participate in believing or acknowledging the illegal immigrant is "essential" to the American Negro. The plaintiff relies on the Establishment Clause rests on the belief that a union of government and religion tends to destroy government and to degrade religion. The defendant ally herself with one form of religion and her legislative law SB1236 for illegal immigrant's from Mexico and Central America who are Catholic a particular religion of a people, whose religion is similar to Nancy Pelosi. The defendant inevitable results are the plaintiff and the Negro race, tax benefits are the hatred, disrespect, legislation is created to deny the procreations of the Negro race and clearly contempt from Nancy Pelosi has been because she was elected by the plaintiff and the Negro race to advocate for our rights. Nancy Pelosi "political" representation is a bait and switch is contrary to the Establishment Clause because SB1236 the California Constitution which makes the illegal immigrant essential is an attempt to regulate the plaintiff and American Negro's First Amendment right. The Court must concern itself with the possibility that SB1236 associations, by engaging in certain kinds of expressive activities, might improperly gain protection for their discriminatory language as it excides American citizens as the American citizen taxes federal and state are going to one religion of a people who are in the U.S. illegally.

SB1236 prohibits the state and local jurisdictions from requiring an employer to use E-Verify. In 2019 - '20 the California budget had a budget line specifically for illegal immigrant it was \$75 million dollars has been allocated for the immigrant community. The state is a sanctuary state and pays \$834.48 every month for the FY2018-19 so they can import constituents into their districts in an attempt to gain future and current votes of those living in that district. The chart below are the cash payments made to all the illegal immigrant in California, all 1.4 million of them. They are paid by the revenue, tax dollars from the plaintiff and the citizens of California. . Nancy Pelosi use the California budget, unconstitutionally to appropriate to a race of people from a foreign land money each month since 1995. Nancy Pelosi's cash Assistance Program for immigrants violates federal and state law; as well as the Commerce Clause. Regents of the University of California v. Bakke, there were two major decisions from the case that still stand today. Firstly, the quota system that was once used by the University of California, Davis' admission process for minority students was ruled unlawful. Secondly, higher-level academic institutions were now prohibited from considering race in the admissions process. The pattern of Nancy Pelosi "political" Acts, she uses a quota system to

accomplish segregation in California. These legislative acts violate the plaintiff and the Negro race's First Amendment rights that the state justification can keep the plaintiff and the Negro race off a list that illegal immigrants from Mexico are on. The 2017 - '18 California budget increases the illegal immigrant program baseline funding and expands the state funded services to include removal defense services, to broaden affirmative relief, and to expands legal training and technical assistance. The program will have a yearly \$45 million investment through the 2019-2020 fiscal year to support the following funded services and representation. For example, AB1593 although it is not getting the budget from CalFire and Nancy Pelosi's scheme, their action and motivations are similar. AB1593 amends the state income tax law, for tax purposes an individual of citizenship of immigration status. Be eligible for earned income tax credits subject for the individual taxpayer. SB1593 then imposes a mandate that requires the state to reimburse local agencies and school districts for certain costs mandated by the state . . . impose a state-mandates local program. . . establishes the continuously appropriated Tax Relief and Refund Account and provides that payments required to be made to taxpayers or other persons from the Personal Income Tax Fund are to be paid from that account, including any amount to be paid as an earned income tax credit in excess of any tax liabilities. Nancy Pelosi's amendments to the state constitution are having the taxpayer pay to allow illegal immigrants to receive, cash, medical benefits, FREE college, tax refunds on income not earned. Nancy Pelosi's actions violate the commerce clause, tax lax, embezzlement of federal funds, misappropriation of state funds, theft, and treason.

In 2014 One California was created for immigrant service funding, 2015-16 State budget for immigrant services \$15 million, 2016-'17 the state budget allocated \$30 million for immigrant service funding, 2017-'18 state budget allocated \$45 million and also in 2017 Governor Brown infused \$20 million to support legal assistance for California DACA people. The California Legislative Caucus has created the Cash Assistance Program for immigrants (CAPI) in fiscal year 2018-19 monthly grants (state welfare) on average gave the immigrant cash of \$813.00 for every illegal immigrant in California. On average in the fiscal year 2019-20 the illegal immigrant received \$834.48; the plaintiff and the Negro race did not get cash from the state. There is a federal and state mandate to get health coverage and if a person does not have it, they are penalized. Nancy Pelosi is working on several state mandates for health care but currently Covered California is the mandated by Nancy Pelosi for the plaintiff and the Negro race. Having health coverage is the law. If you do not have it, you may have to pay a penalty to the California Franchise Tax Board. The penalty for not having coverage the entire year will be at least \$750 per adult and \$375 per dependent child under 18 in the household when

you file your 2020 state income tax return in 2021. A family of four that goes uninsured for the whole year would face a penalty of at least \$2,250. The penalty will be applied by the California Franchise Tax Board. Again, as the facts show that Nancy Pelosi has separate laws in California therefore, nationwide for two different nationalities of people and one race happens to be American the others whatever. Question to the Court, currently under California law, the California Franchise tax Board can penalize a Californian citizen for not having health coverage by issuing a penalty. Nancy Pelosi is in violation of a mandate that cannot be upheld by the Commerce Clause. Under Nancy Pelosi's mandate, a typical family of four that goes uninsured for the whole year would face a penalty of at least \$2,250. And, under California law ABX1 and SBX1 expanded Medi-Cal to immigrants' who are adults, children in California. All 1.4 million illegal immigrants get FREE health care. Second question, is the penalty Nancy Pelosi impose on American citizens in violation of the holding in NFIB v. Sebelius? The Court stated an individual mandate cannot be upheld as an exercise of Congress' power under the Commerce Clause. There the Court held, individual mandate that's requiring the purchase of health insurance under the AFA was not the regulation of commercial activity so much as *inactivity* and was, accordingly, impermissible under the Commerce Clause. The question again is, under the Commerce Clause does penalty from Nancy Pelosi which only is imposed on American citizens in violation of the holding in NFIB v. Sebelius since immigrants are mandated to get free healthcare?

Nancy Pelosi is guilty of legislative fraud by placing the California Department of Social Services known as CDSS as its main source of receiving the money from the state and they organize in a group with criminal activities as the primary focus, and with the intent to promote and further criminal activity and their activity is the legal fits the definition of a gang member in California. One of sixteen departments in the California Health and Human Services Agency, the California Department of Social Services mission statements says on their website, they provide aid, services and protection of the poor immigrant children and families. Nancy Pelosi's "schemozzle" with financing of the illegal immigrant community involves the CDSS. Some of the immigrant services are financed from the California General Fund and some through The CARES ACT and soon to be the Heroes Act of 2020. In the 2020 California Budget are several budget lines for illegal immigrant services in California and the CDSS; their premise reflects the cost of providing services to immigrants who reside in California. These services include (1.) assistant to help applicants obtain DACA or other immigration remedies, (2.) assistance to help applicants with naturalization, (3.) legal training and technical

assistance to CDSS contractors that provide immigration legal services to these applicants, (4.) education outreach activities to immigrant communities about DACA or other immigration remedies for naturalization.

The amending of H.R. 4277, known as the Social Security Independence and Program Improvement Act of 1994 helps with Nancy Pelosi's cash-flow it established as the social security administration as an independent agency to make improvements to old age, survivors and disability. Under the CARES ACT of 2020 the defendant amended the Social Security Independence and Program Improvement Act of 1994 to aid in the scheme of embezzlement the treason. In section 1109, United States Treasury Program Management Authority, (1) the terms "appropriate Federal banking agency" and "insured depository institution" have the meanings given those terms in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813) with authorizes the department of treasury and the Chairman of the Farm Credit Administration shall establish criteria for insured depository institutions, insured credit unions, institutions of the Farm Credit System chartered under the Farm Credit Act of 1971 and other lenders that do not already participate in lending under programs of the Administration, to participate in the paycheck protection program to provide loans under this section until the date on which the national emergency declared by the President under the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.) with respect to the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) expires. IN Section 2304 Modification of Limitation of losses for taxpayer other than corporation. Nancy Pelosi is similar to the California budget which has a line item budget in the U.S. Covid19 Emergency Health Response specifically for illegal immigrants who under the CDC are given grants and she has appropriated for agriculture programs, an additional \$9,500,000,000, to remain available until expended, to prevent, prepare for, and respond to coronavirus by providing support for agricultural producers impacted by coronavirus, including producers of specialty crops, producers that supply local food systems, including farmers markets, restaurants, and schools, and livestock producers, including dairy producers and this was on top of the \$560 million given to California by the CDC to provide resources to state and local jurisdictions in support of our nation's response to the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19). In April 2020 Nancy Pelosi offered legislation to pay \$500 addition and Covid19 testing to undocumented immigrants along with the \$75 million dollar cash assistance program allowed for immigrants living in Californian a one-tome \$500 of \$1000 per household, which is equivalent to welfare or the lottery depending on the Courts view. Nancy Pelosi similar to my complaints use partners and vendors a total of twelve nonprofits to vet by phone applicants. One nonprofit is the Coalition for Humane Immigrant Rights of Los Angeles. In addition, Nancy Pelosi has under the Farm Production and Conservation Program, Farm Service Agency an additional amount for salaries

and Expenses, \$3,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2021. Congress as of 8-30-2020 has refused to meet to extend unemployment to American and the U.S. Government is providing the plaintiff tax dollars to illegal immigrants until 2021, the DNC and Nancy Pelosi is coming tax fraud and treason upon the plaintiff and the Negro race the Court must view this no other way. Not only are they in violation of affirmative action but Nancy Pelosi is trying to repeal affirmative action in California under proposition 16 and a yes will support their current affirmative action laws. The Court must hold, Nancy Pelosi is in violation of the Social Security Administration as a n Independent Agency Act known as H.R. 4277. In section 1631(e) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1383(e)) as amended by subsection (d)(2) of this section, is amended by adding at the end the following (7)(A) The Secretary shall request the Immigration and Naturalization Service or the Centers for Disease Control to provide the Secretary with whatever medical information, identification information, and employment history either such entity has with respect to any alien who has applied for benefits under title XVI to the extent that the information is relevant to any determination relating to eligibility for such benefits under title XVI. Nancy Pelosi is also guilty of violating section 320 extension of the FICA tax exemption and certain tax rules to individuals who enter the united states under a visa issued under section 101 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. Nancy Pelosi is guilty of violating section 205, Disregard of Cost-of-Living Increases for conditioned eligibility for work incentives and (b)the amendment made by subsection(a)shall apply to eligibility determinations for months after December 1994. The Court must hold there is reason to believe that fraud was involved in the application of an individual for monthly insurance benefits under title II or for benefits under title XVI, the Inspector General shall be contacted and make available to the Secretary information identifying the defendant unless a United States attorney, or equivalent State prosecutor, with jurisdiction over potential or actual related criminal cases, certifies, in writing, that there is a substantial risk that making the information so available in a particular investigation or redetermining the eligibility of the individual for such benefits would jeopardize the criminal prosecution of any person who is a subject of the investigation from which the information is derived. In section 307 Exclusion of totalization benefits from the application of the Windfall elimination program, (a) In general section 215 (a)(7) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 415(a)(7)) is amended (2) in subparagraph (E), by inserting after in the case of an individual the following whose eligibility for old-age or disability insurance benefits is based on an agreement concluded pursuant to section 233 or an individual. Also, (b) conforming Amendment Relating to Benefits Under 1939 act section 215(d)(3) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 415(d)(3)) is amended by striking ``but excluding" and all that follows through

"1937" and inserting but excluding (I) a payment under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1974 or 1937, and (II) a payment by a social security system of a foreign country based on an agreement concluded between the United States and such foreign country pursuant to section 233.

Another example Nancy Pelosi hates for the American people and America, in the 2019-20 California budget was \$7 million for legal services for undocumented students, faculty, and staff through the Health and Human Services budget. In the 2020 California budget, the CSU is receiving a larger base augmentation than the UC, \$300 million as opposed to \$240 million for immigrant services. The defendant, UC Regents, Janet Napolitano and DHS are all complicit in re-segregating California and all involved have lines items in the California budget. Each year to constantly segregate in healthcare, education, workplace, state and federal government services, all for the illegal immigrant who are not their constituents, they are not U.S. citizen and therefore not entitled to the benefits of life Nancy Pelosi, one in half Negro, are denied to the plaintiff and the Negro citizen. Negro, White, Asian, Korean, Middle Eastern all reside in California and who are here legally and or American citizens. Are mandated by federal law to buy health insurance through the California Exchange. All are mandated to either take out a loan or do not go to college. Nancy Pelosi is in violation of Affirmative Action and the plaintiff asks the Court to hold with an injunction to stop the funding of these programs and laws for the illegal immigrant from Mexico and Central American. The plaintiff calls for Nancy Pelosi to provide college funding for all California citizens similar in services, monies, and job opportunities for individuals that the illegal immigrant has been getting since 1995. The Constitution is colored blind, Justice Harlen stated in the holding of *Sweat v. Painter*, which implied that laws in Texas for blacks was not sufficiently equal when it came to University admissions. The purpose of SB54 and DACA and SB1593 to exclude Negro's from the UC system and tech jobs in Silicon Valley. Nancy Pelosi has provided no alternative schools for the plaintiff and Negro Americas similar to those of illegal status Mexican and Central American immigrants at the UC California Universities. The state's partner, the Leadership Group of Silicon Valley provided legal backing in the early '90 that led to the illegal immigrant unionizing and getting support to get jobs in the Apple, Google, HP and other jobs in Silicon Valley. The equal protection clause requires treatment of all United States citizens, and the Court can strike down Nancy Pelosi's legislations SB54, One California, AB1593 and DACA as laws that maintain segregation. The defendant cannot provide a comparable education to the plaintiff and the Negro race and other races in California; therefore, the Court must hold separate but equal in California is illegal in education and in public facilities. This mere existence of separate schools

for members from a different country and different heritage and in the U'S illegally, does not satisfy the Equal Protection Clause if the education received and the job opportunities created for the Negro race and Mexican and Central American races are not equal. The "separate but equal" doctrine has been unconstitutional since *Brown v. Board of Education*.

The California Budget Act of 2018 appropriated \$45 million for immigrant services another \$7 million for undocumented services for the immigrant community and \$10 million for the Temporary Protected Status for immigrant services. In FY19 the funding remained the same but \$1.3 million was added for operating costs. Nancy Pelosi methodology for the immigrant services is, it is calculated by taking the total funds less the state operations cost in each fiscal year. The funding comes from the California General Fund. Nancy Pelosi continues her, separate but equal religious doctrine, the same year the California budget appropriated \$45 million for immigrant services, Nancy Pelosi's local school districts in California had to devote 16.3% of their local districts' budgets because the state of California cut local school funding. For example, in Northern California schools in San Jose, the Oak Grove School District still plans to close three or four elementary schools in the fall. The East Side Union High School District board resolved to eliminate 66 jobs over two years. And the Oakland Unified School District isn't reversing the \$9 million in painful cuts. Also, the Cupertino Union School District, which faces cutting \$5 million in 2018-'19, after trimming \$2.6 million the year prior. But for immigrants Nancy Pelosi created the Career Technical Education Incentive Grant Program, this is the program that the plaintiff tax dollars are used for. The program is for illegal immigrants who are not eligible for federal grants but it's a partnership between tech companies and the California department of education. This program had a \$15 million dollar budget in 2018.

The average monthly payment the illegal immigrants got \$820.60 month in fiscal year 2018-19 and \$834.48 in FY2019-20. Illegal immigrants from Mexico and Central America are given the plaintiff's tax money then guaranteed never to be harassed, or be suspected in a crime, questioned by Nancy Pelosi's employees, and given American jobs all by the U.S. Government. As the Court knows the Thirteenth Amendment was not a mere prohibition of State slavery but this Court must make it clear in its holding that it's upholding the Thirteenth Amendment to take the enforcement of sanctioned State legislations that led to segregation in California. In fact, subsection 1982 operates upon the unofficial acts of private individuals, therefore, the Court must grant an injunction to stop payments to illegal immigrants from receiving embezzled state funds. Whether sanctions are by

the state law or not isn't the issue here. The question is, by the force of the Thirteenth Amendment to abolish slavery and established universal freedoms, does that include the plaintiff's tax dollars that are being used as the power to allow the illegal immigrant racial acquisitions to real and personal property? Plaintiff believes the Thirteenth Amendment was the enabling empowerment by Congress to do much more. The plaintiff looks to the Courts wisdom in establishing universal freedom for the plaintiff and the Negro race. The Courts guidance to the plaintiff comes from the Amendments' clause, Congress with power to pass all laws necessary and proper for abolishing all badges and incidents of slavery in the United States, including Nancy Pelosi legislations listed in these complaints.

DACA, DAPA, SB54, AB1593 is legislation for immunity for immigrants, growth in individual districts by immigrants, monthly payments to immigrants by California, amending of the California Tax code, campaign contribution from Silicon Valley tech companies, The Sanctuary City Ordinance are all in violation of California's AB 781 is the Dymally-Alatorre Bilingual Services Act ("the Act"), including any requirement that an employee be bilingual as a pretext for discrimination on the basis of race, national origin legislation for immigrants, or other unlawful discrimination in employment practices, including specifically any requirement that an employee be bilingual and bilingual hiring requirements and § 11011 Affirmative Action Programs are what is offered to illegal immigrants. In Justice Clark's endorsing comment in the Gust holding, he suggested Congress under subsection 5 of the Fourteenth Amendment can go further in reaching private behavior than the Court would under Subsection 1, similar to the Negro race not being entitled to public facilities the plaintiff wants the same services for himself and his race. The plaintiff seeks in the Courts holding the state's obligation to "basic corollary", the right as a citizen to use the same services and facilities without discrimination on the basis of race. Nancy Pelosi's actions are willful under 18 U.S.C subsection 242 and "under color of law" as to deprive the plaintiff and his race a specific constitutional right. Nancy Pelosi should be found guilty of depriving the plaintiff and the Negro race, under color of law adjudicated by their due process of law rights. This Court should find accordingly that the defendant under color of the law conspired to deprive the plaintiff and the Negro race of their fourteenth Amendment rights. Justice Frankfurter holding in *United States v. Williams* stated, the relationship of individual of the individual and Federal Government are not those rights which the Constitution merely guarantees from the interference by the State. Justices Douglas joined by Justices Reed, Burton and Clark in the same case above stated, that subsection 242 was applicable to the fourteenth Amendment rights extent to rights guaranteed against state action by the Fourteenth Amendment and 242 is limited to rights which the Federal Government

can secure against invasion by private persons. Therefore, it must be clear to the Court that defendant's purposes were willful, and purpose is to deprive the plaintiff and the Negro race their due process rights and their Fourteenth Amendment constitutional rights. When the phrase under color of law was incorporated into the Re-construction civil rights statutes the ordinary canon of statutory interpretation that the Court should accord to SB1236 the meaning intended by the California legislators suggests a quite conventional legal argument in support of the decision in Monroe. This Court in using the "under color of law" language, Congress adopted a common law term of art with a well-known meaning in order to maintain fidelity to legislative intent of SB1236 this Court must interpret the statute in light of the legal understanding of the phrase that prevailed at the time of the law's passage. The Court must interpret using the "under color of law" language as it is intended as immunity for illegal immigrants and using the "under color of law" language and the must interpret using the "under color of law" language as it is intended as immunity for Nancy Pelosi and this is because SB1236 is a work contract and SB54 is a work contract as they both provide legislative immunity which is 'under color of law' and Nancy Pelosi has immunity "under color of law," which is why she and other city and state employee's violate the laws. The plaintiff asks the Court to view California Constitution SB1236 from a cognitive theory to examine the language meaning of the color of law of section 1983. By reading the dissenting in Monroe, the Court can apply the prior decisions which have given 'under color of law' a content that ignores the meaning fairly comported by the words of the text. Or to the opposite conclusion in *Screws*, that the statute was designed to embrace only action which the State in fact authorized, the words 'under color of state law' were hardly apt words to express the idea. The Court will find cognitive theory provides an intelligible methodology, supported by extensive empirical evidence, which makes it possible to test these competing assertions which the Court will conclude California Constitution SB1236 is unconstitutional. Thus, metaphorical expressions such as "*essential workers*" and "*Yes We Can*" are not instances of a single "up" metaphor, but rather different metaphorical expressions predicated on different conceptual metaphors in this case *CONTROL* over the American Negro race by State laws under contract with a foreign nation of a people, written by California City and State employees.

The Court must hold, State employees and Federal employees, political politicians and states attorney generals cannot give, offer, or promise a foreign nationals immunity. This complaint has proven that the California legislations offer immunity to illegal immigrants who have entered the U.S. illegally is unconstitutional. DAPA, SB54, SB1593, AB2792, SB141, SB1310, ABX1, SBX1, AB131, AB130, AB1236, AB2779, AB2279, AB1576, SB1236, SB1159, SB477,

AB263, AB2792, AB1576 all are in violation of 8 U.S.C. subsection 1101, Section (8) U.S. Code - Unannotated Title 8. Aliens and Nationality and these laws were affected by the Nationality Act of 1940. (8) an officer or employee of a State or political subdivision of a State acting under color of authority under this subsection, or any agreement entered into under this subsection, shall be considered to be acting under color of Federal authority for purposes of determining the liability, and immunity from suit, of the officer or employee in a civil action brought under Federal or State law. (9) Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to require any State or political subdivision of a State to enter into an agreement with the Attorney General under this subsection. (10) Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to require an agreement under this subsection in order for any officer or employee of a State or political subdivision of a State (A) to communicate with the Attorney General regarding the immigration status of any individual, including reporting knowledge that a particular alien is not lawfully present in the United States; or (B) otherwise to cooperate with the Attorney General in the identification, apprehension, detention, or removal of aliens not lawfully present in the United States. (10) Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to require an agreement under this subsection in order for any officer or employee of a State or political subdivision of a State (A) to communicate with the Attorney General regarding the immigration status of any individual, including reporting knowledge that a particular alien is not lawfully present in the United States; or (B) otherwise to cooperate with the Attorney General in the identification, apprehension, detention, or removal of aliens not lawfully present in the United States. Nancy Pelosi has no legal standing to justify the existence of any of these religious racist laws. The federal law is clear, 8 U.S.C. subsection 1101, Section (8) U.S. Code - Unannotated Title 8. Aliens and Nationality. The white man does not have the religious authority offered to it in the Constitution to offer immunity to a race of people for a foreign land that shares the same deviant is discussing relegation's view. The Court must hold Christian Religion is unconstitutional moreover, the compliant before this Court reflects that they are likely to succeed on the merits. The harm to the American Negro the moving party if relief is not granted and the likelihood of the American Negro the moving party success is that the Constitution protects their privileges and immunities as they are American Citizen of the United States, as distinguished from illegal immigrants who are residents of the States and the object of the Fourteenth Amendment is undoubtably to enforce the absolute equity of the American Negro race before the law and why this injunction favors the respective parties and that the American Negro the plaintiff's race is likely to suffer irreparable harm in the absence of this preliminary relief from California Constitution SB1236.

In Title 8 Aliens and nationality (F)(i), the federal laws here are clear not state, no employee of the state or federal government can give immunity to anyone especially from Mexico who are illegal aliens having a residence in a foreign country which he has no intention of abandoning, who is a bona fide student qualified to pursue a full course of study and who seeks to enter the United States temporarily and solely for the purpose of pursuing such a course of study consistent with section 1184(l) 1 of this title at an established college, university, seminary, conservatory, academic high school, elementary school, or other academic institution or in an accredited language training program in the United States, particularly designated by him and approved by the Attorney General after consultation with the Secretary of Education, which institution or place of study shall have agreed to report to the Attorney General the termination of attendance of each nonimmigrant student, and if any such institution of learning or place of study fails to make reports promptly the approval shall be withdrawn, (ii) the alien spouse and minor children of any alien described in clause (i) if accompanying or following to join such an alien, and (iii) an alien who is a national of Canada or Mexico, who maintains actual residence and place of abode in the country of nationality, who is described in clause (i) except that the alien's qualifications for and actual course of study may be full or part-time, and who commutes to the United States institution or place of study from Canada or Mexico; (G)(i) a designated principal resident representative of a foreign government recognized by the United States, which foreign government is a member of an international organization entitled to enjoy privileges, exemptions, and immunities as an international organization under the International Organizations Immunities Act (59 Stat. 669) 22 U.S.C. 288 et seq., accredited resident members of the staff of such representatives, and members of his or their immediate family; (S) subject to section 1184(k) of this title, an alien... (i) who the Attorney General determines (I) is in possession of critical reliable information concerning a criminal organization or enterprise; (II) is willing to supply or has supplied such information to Federal or State law enforcement authorities or a Federal or State court; and (III) whose presence in the United States the Attorney General determines is essential to the success of an authorized criminal investigation or the successful prosecution of an individual involved in the criminal organization or enterprise. (H) an alien (i) [(a) Repealed. Pub. L. 106-95, §2(c), Nov. 12, 1999, 113 Stat. 1316] (b) subject to section 1182(j)(2) of this title, who is coming temporarily to the United States to perform services (other than services described in subclause (a) during the period in which such subclause applies and other than services described in subclause (ii)(a). (P)) in a specialty occupation described in section 1184(i)(1) of this title the Secretary of Labor determines and certifies to the Attorney General that the intending employer has filed with the Secretary an application under section

1182(n)(1) of this title, or (b1) who is entitled to enter the United States under and in pursuance of the provisions of an agreement listed in section 1184(g)(8)(A) of this title, who is engaged in a specialty occupation described in section 1184(i)(3) of this title, and with respect to whom the Secretary of Labor determines and certifies to the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Secretary of State that the intending employer has filed with the Secretary of Labor an attestation under section 1182(t)(1) of this title, or (c) who is coming temporarily to the United States to perform services as a registered nurse, who meets the qualifications described in section 1182(m)(1) of this title, and with respect to whom the Secretary of Labor determines and certifies to the Attorney General that an unexpired attestation is on file and in effect under section 1182(m)(2) of this title for the facility (as defined in section 1182(m)(6) of this title) for which the alien will perform the services; or (ii)(a) having a residence in a foreign country which he has no intention of abandoning who is coming temporarily to the United States to perform agricultural labor or services, as defined by the Secretary of Labor in regulations and including agricultural labor defined in section 3121(g) of title 26, agriculture as defined in section 203(f) of title 29, and the pressing of apples for cider on a farm, of a temporary or seasonal nature, or (b) having a residence in a foreign country which he has no intention of abandoning who is coming temporarily to the United States to perform other temporary service or labor if unemployed persons capable of performing such service or labor cannot be found in this country, but this clause shall not apply to graduates of medical schools coming to the United States to perform services as members of the medical profession; or (iii) having a residence in a foreign country which he has no intention of abandoning who is coming temporarily to the United States as a trainee, other than to receive graduate medical education or training, in a training program that is not designed primarily to provide productive employment; and the alien spouse and minor children of any such alien specified in this paragraph if accompanying him or following to join him.

Nancy Pelosi including DHS have created state laws to get around federal immigration laws, the only reason the federal and state would coordinate efforts on this scale is to kill of the Negro race by California Constitution SB1236, the plaintiff's race. SB1236 is an endorsement from the State of California the defendant to hire, promote and pay a specific wage to illegal immigrants which by its definition excludes Americas form the workforce "under the color of law". The plaintiff's asks the Court to view California Constitution SB1236 role under constitutional and statutory law as it relates to Constitution which states the framework of all United States laws. Here SB1236 is one of many of Nancy Pelosi's use the law as a tool to unconstitutionally change and reappropriate state

and federal monies in which they divert from the American Negro's community to the illegal immigrants from Mexico and Central America and the Catholic Religion from 1421 to 2021 SB1236 is a "Blueprint" to apartheid also known as "Build Back Better". Similarly, to California's Constitution for illegal immigrants SB1236 and "Build Back Better" a federal constitution is a sign of his gratitude to pope that allows "joe" to be a good catholic and continue to get communion. As it was for Pope Martin V for supporting his work of territorial expansion in Africa and for granting the request of his father king John I, Prince Henry the Navigator, who was a "major role player" in the Portuguese expeditions in West Africa, gave to the pope as gifts some of the first set of African captives brought into Portugal in 1421. These were men taken by force during the first expedition and military conquest of Africa led by captains Antão Gonçalves and Nunó Tristão during this period. Attesting to this development, a Portuguese traveler and historian João de Barros (1496-1579) wrote as follows:

Since the major intention of Prince Henry the Navigator for discovering these lands was geared towards subjecting the barbaric nations under the yoke of Christ and to extend the Royal heritage as well as to promote the honor and the glory of the Portuguese empire, and he (Henry the Navigator), through the captives, which Antão Gonçalves and Nunó Tristão brought from Africa, and through whom they received information about the inhabitants of those lands in Africa, he wanted to proclaim this good news to pope Martin V, who then was the Head of the Catholic Church by giving him the first fruits of this enterprise, which duelly belonged to him, because this work was performed to the glory of God and for the spread of the Christian faith.

By so doing, Prince Henry the Navigator intended to beg the pope to allot a perpetual right of ownership to the Crown in Portugal over other explorations and discoveries that will be made in future along the Atlantic Coasts of Africa. He also begged for the granting of plenary indulgence to any one of his military crew who may lose his life in the course of fighting the natives in Africa so that his soul will be given a place of rest at the bosom of St. Peter the head of the Apostles. These intentions have been corroborated by João de Barros when he further wrote:

also he wanted to beg him (pope Martin V), while he had begun this enterprise for many years and by so doing... had spent a greater part of his wealth on this expedition, that it might please him (Martin V) to donate perpetually to the Crown of Portugal all the lands discovered along the African Atlantic which lay beyond Cape Bojador and extending up to the Indian coast; and to grant eternal forgiveness of sins to all those who might die in the course of carrying out this conquest, since God had placed him (Martin V) on the throne of Saint Peter.

In section 217 of the Immigration and Nationality Act 8 U.S.C. 1187 to develop an intergovernmental network of interoperable electronic data systems that (1) facilitates real-time access to that country's law enforcement and intelligence information that is needed by the Department of State and the Immigration and Naturalization Service to screen visa applicants and applicants for admission into the United States to identify aliens who are inadmissible or deportable under the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.); (2) is interoperable with the electronic data system implemented under section 1722 of that title; and (3) performs in accordance with implementation of the technology standard referred to in section 1722(a) of that title.

It becomes clear to the plaintiff and the Court must concur here "joe" Biden leaving the U.S. to get approval from the Pope to kill off or enslave the American Negro is confirmation "Build Back Better" is a Catholic Religious Order. Similarly, to a federal order the Department of Homeland Security needed to comply to section 217 of the Immigration and Nationality Act 8 U.S.C. 1187 to develop an intergovernmental network of interoperable electronic data systems that section (1) facilitates real-time access to that country's law enforcement and intelligence information that is needed by the Department of State and the Immigration and Naturalization Service to screen visa applicants and applicants for admission into the United States to identify aliens who are inadmissible or deportable under the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.); section (2) is interoperable with the electronic data system implemented under section 1722 of this title; and section (3) performs in accordance with implementation of the technology standard referred to in section 1722(a) of this title. And Nancy Pelosi is in violation of section (3) Implementation (A) Department of Homeland Security (i) In general The Secretary of Homeland Security shall provide all border and immigration officials who inspect or review travel or identity documents as part of their official duties with the training described in paragraph (1)(C). Clearly the DHS and Nancy Pelosi are a terrorist organization creating new state laws, so they are financed by federal dollars for a foreign race of people, therefore setting up a foreign puppet government within the U.S. borders. Nancy Pelosi and Janet Napolitano, while under the color of authority, drove upon a state highway to enter into another state overreached her authority, to circumvent the nations federal immigration laws and created a memorandum dictating, the immunity for a foreign race, which states will pay for the existence of the foreign race knowing her job as the head of the Department of Homeland Security was to secure the American people. The Court must hold, Nancy Pelosi is a terrorist upon the American people, and the Democratic National Committee is a terrorist organization, Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty

Act of 1996. The plaintiff seeks restitution to the Negro race per section 232, victims of terrorism act, (a) Victims of Acts of Terrorism Outside the United States. The Director may make supplemental grants as provided in section 1404(a) to States to provide compensation and assistance to the residents of such States who, while outside of the territorial boundaries of the United States, are victims of a terrorist act or mass violence and are not persons eligible for compensation under title VIII of the Omnibus Diplomatic Security and Antiterrorism Act of 1986. (b) Victims of Terrorism Within the United States.--The Director may make supplemental grants as provided in section 1404(d)(4)(B) to States for eligible crime victim compensation and assistance programs to provide emergency relief, including crisis response efforts, assistance, training, and technical assistance, for the benefit of victims of terrorist acts or mass violence occurring within the United States and may provide funding to United States Attorney's Offices for use in coordination with State victim compensation and assistance efforts in providing emergency relief. (b) Funding of Compensation and Assistance to Victims of Terrorism, Mass Violence, and Crime. Section 1402(d)(4) of the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10601(d)(4)) is amended to read as follows: (4)(A) If the sums available in the Fund are sufficient to fully provide grants to the States pursuant to section 1403(a)(1), the Director may retain any portion of the Fund that was deposited during a fiscal year that was in excess.

It must be clear to the Court that California Constitution SB1236 shows legislative intent to violate the U.S. Constitution which this Court may view the evidence in this compliant intrinsic or extrinsic or both. Here intrinsic evidence is the legislative intent of SB1236, text itself which includes statutory language in question or imply statutory purpose within which to interpret the language of SB1236. Here, extrinsic evidence includes the social or legal context of SB1236 the Court will find support in by the contemporaneous case law or companion legislation in providing social services to illegal immigrants or commerce clause violation provide insights into the legislative intent of SB1236 a contract to work for illegal immigrants in California. The Court must hold, illegal immigrants are allowed under California Constitution SB1236 authored by Nancy Pelosi draconian laws to take over American jobs which created the homeless problem in California. In 2020 the immigrants had on the California State Budget a monetary figure as a line item on the state budget which allocated \$75 million dollars of American Negro's tax dollars to be allocated all for foreign race of people who are in the U.S. illegally. The Court must note, during the televised 2020 Democratic National Committee Party week of speeches. Every speech was about immigration and two Negro politicians, Harris and Powell, decided that day they didn't want to be black anymore and stated that night in the DNC convention, that they were immigrants.

The illegal immigrants from Mexico and Central American are illiterate adults who are childlike people to the State of California. SB1236 has made the illegal immigrant who is uneducated, and skill not only compete but SB1236 is a contract to hire, contract for wage stability if not wage increases. For example, in an article in thenation.com on November 12, 2021, under the tile "West Hollywood Just Won the Highest Minimum Wage in the Country" is similar to "joe" \$13 an hour minimum wage for illegal immigrants in a Presidential Executive Order on his first day in office.


All illegal immigrants who have entered California prior to August 22, 1995, in are all financed by states and the federal government including by The CARES ACT. Nancy Pelosi has allocated \$23 million for immigrant college tuitions and The Heroes Act, theirs a line item in the act for immigrants in California. Also, the farm workers union are allowed to get pensions from the Veterans Affairs office and become members of the Veterans Affairs. The illegal immigrants have their medical payments paid for by the Heroes Act. How that works is in the Hero's Act which was written by the California Democratic Party, has a line item which states, United Farm Workers Union members are allowed to join the U.S. Veteran Affairs for benefits and retirement. This is treason by the Nancy Pelosi, leader of the democratic party who has aligned the financing of a foreign race of people by tax dollars to be used for illegal immigrants. The Court must hold Nancy Pelosi has committed treason upon the U.S. Government. Nancy Pelosi has worked out to have farmworkers union members be allowed to join the VA and benefit from that organization's services. With the CARES and the Heroes Act's paying for these immigrant services every year every American from Main to Hawaii will be paying for generations the financial services illegal immigrants are getting. Nancy Pelosi has her arthritic knees on the necks of the citizen. Nancy Pelosi in this case have forced indentured servitude on all the American people. All American's and their families who have fought in wars for the freedom for America and the world. All have been made worthless and their death not worth a "dime" all by the Nancy Pelosi's "political" actions. Nancy Pelosi is evil people.

Nancy Pelosi's California Constitutions SB54, AB1576, AB2779, SB1236, AB130, AB131, AB4, ABX1, SBX1, AB263, AB1024, SB1310, SB477, SB141, SB1159, AB1593 are funding of foreign nationals is illegal, and they are supported by the United States Government employees, who are Kevin DeLeon, Nancy Pelosi, Gavin Newsom, Maria Elena Durazo, Eloise Gomez Reyes, Janet Napolitano, Eleni Kounalakis, Xavier Becerra, Alex Padilla, Devin Nunes and Democratic National Committee. The defendant as state and city employees are guilty of segregation and in violation of Affirmative Action in the workplace and

of Treason; as well as, they violate California's AB 781 which is the Dymally-Alatorre Bilingual Services Act including any requirement that an employee be bilingual, as a pretext for discrimination on the basis of race, national origin, or other unlawful discrimination in employment, including specifically any requirement that an employee be bilingual and bilingual hiring requirements; as well as, subsection 11011 Affirmative Action Programs. Nancy Pelosi actions violate the plaintiff's and the Negro race's Thirteenth Amendment rights to limit the applications of funding and financial welfare and all state services to DACA, DAPA, the sanctuary city and The Dreams Act and other illegal immigrant services. These state actions by the defendant are all racial discriminations upon the plaintiff and the Negro race. Nancy Pelosi's legislation furnished for the "private" use of a foreign people to use for their enjoyment and given American jobs, finance their education and paid for by the plaintiff and his Negro race, healthcare is paid for by the plaintiff and the illegal immigrants are encored to buy and sell real property and all while given immunity to never be tried or accused for any state or federal crime. This is in violation of affirmative action laws in California.

Nancy Pelosi's tax embezzlement scheme includes the California Department of Social Services and sixteen departments and offices to funnel state tax dollars into the California Health and Human Services Agency which is a front to channel money that comes from the general fund into the listed above immigrants' legislations. For example, all the laws have a reimbursement clause meaning it perpetual-the funding never ends, the taxpayer is funning these illegal schemes unwillingly and unknowingly. Nancy Pelosi created a scheme that involves the federal government reimbursing California for the taxes the defendant take from state taxes and local school taxes, then use those very same tax dollars to pay for the illegal benefits scams, known as the legislations, above. In the 2019-'20 in the chart below California Governor Gavin Newsom's State Budget proposal called for the CSU to receive a total increase of \$562 million over this fiscal current year for illegal immigrant tuition. Similarly in 2020 the defendant provides free four-year college tuition free to illegal immigrants and SB54 and SB1236 and other illegal immigrant legislations in California provide free tuition, money, food, and medical services, American Negro's do not have the luxury of free or political representation as the illegal immigrants as American Negro's voted for Nancy Pelosi in the 2020 election, we pay as we go. The defendant have also included in the 2020 state budget a base (ongoing) increase of \$300 million as well as \$247 million in one-time money for immigrant services like home healthcare for those so-called DAPA recipients and \$1400 to \$2800 in salaries they provide to illegal immigrants, for example in Fremont California the week of November 7, 2020

they are giving \$1000 a month for two years to illegal immigrants and Congressman Ro Khanna Democrat is responsible for disseminated segregation in Silicon Valley. This scheme is similar to the one just spoke to the Court about, but this budget proposal also included \$7 million for legal services for undocumented students, faculty, and staff through the Health and Human Services budget. Also, Nancy Pelosi had a proposition in the 2020 election to repeal Affirmative Action. These complaints have addressed the violations Nancy Pelosi has committed by violating the California Constitution on Affirmative Action.



Nancy Pelosi is guilty of money Laundering, the creation and implementation of new anti-money laundering programs and creates potential criminal liability for institutions that are 'willfully blind' to money-laundering taking place within their institutions, this statement comes from The Patriot Act's provision. Title II of the Patriot Act, states that financial institutions must implement procedures to verify the identity of their customers and check their identities against lists of known or suspected terrorists. The Patriot Act's provisions require the creation and implementation of new anti-money laundering programs and creates potential criminal liability for institutions that are "willfully blind" to money-laundering taking place within their institutions. The conversion of my property is that it must be done with a serious intent of depriving plaintiff of his and the Negro races rights. The legislation set by Nancy Pelosi is to distribute the money to the nonprofits who the defendant describe as partners of California. They in turn will distribute the money to the immigrants. Nancy Pelosi created immigration policies and scams that gives the illegal immigrants a separate budget line item on the California state budget to aligned with the CalFire Fire Protection budget. These separate but equal services are funded each year by the CalFire budget, which

comes from state taxes and federal grants. As the state fire budget increases then automatically does the immigrant budget. As it increases it is aligned with the plaintiff tax dollars; as well as federal money which is given to California gets for reimbursement for the states fire suppression services, by the federal government. The plaintiff tax dollars are being used to pay for the existence of the illegal immigrant therefore, they or, nor were ever an 'essential worker' as SB54 proclaims. The illegal immigrant from Mexico and Central America owes it mere existence to the legislation above. Without the legislations above the illegal immigrant status of 'essential workers' the American Negro have proven the illegal immigrant from Mexico and Central America is 'uselessness'.

The Democratic National Committee platform hasn't changed in 52 years is still rings true throughout these complaints. "Segregation today, Segregation tomorrow, Segregation forever" and Joe Biden was Senator then and now as President, "Build Back Better" the Court is aware White Supremacy was the motto of the Alabama Democratic Party until 1966. The Court must be aware White Supremacy was the motto of the California Democratic Party in 2021. The State of Mississippi did not ratify the Thirteenth Amendment, which outlawed slavery, until 1995. For example, Jen Gong Lum came to the United States in 1904, in 1923 she married had children and moved to Rosedale, Mississippi. Her daughter was expelled from public school because the state only educated whites. The State of California violated the American Negro's Thirteenth Amendment rights when in 2013 Nancy Pelosi created California Constitution AB263 which provides work workplace rights employer retaliation a business can lose its business license if an illegal immigrant lodges a complaint against them, this realization by Nancy Pelosi does not allow illegal immigrants social services in California.

The history of the George Corley Wallace who served as the 45th Governor of Alabama for four terms is best remembered for his staunch segregationist and populist views and the speech above, segregation today segregation tomorrow segregation forever is consistent with Catholic theology as written in 1841 by Bishop John England of Charleston. He describes how the Fourth Provincial Council of Baltimore (*joe biden is from Baltimore*) accepted the practice concerning slavery and saw a continuation of slavery but that he saw the impossibility of abolishing it in South Carolina. Bishop John England expressed admirably the contemporary opinion that the common Catholic teaching on slavery was unchangeable, There is no danger possibility, on our principles that Catholic theology should ever be tainted with the fanaticism of abolition. Catholics may and do differ, in regard to slavery, and other points of human policy, when considered as ethical and political questions. But our theology is fixed, and is, and

must be the same now as it was for the first eight or nine centuries of Christianity; in Catholic theology the question on slavery is a settled one. In 1841 Bishop England wrote that the Church has always accepted domestic slavery and the contemporary opinion that the common Catholic teaching on slavery was unchanged. In 1991 Joe Biden now President of the United States accepted domestic slavery by sponsoring in the 102nd Congress S.1043 Police Officers Bill of Rights, but he is also responsible for many of the policies that led to the breakdown of the plaintiff and the Negro race and criminalizes an entire race, consistent with Catholic theology. Biden's mass incarceration accepted domestic slavery of the plaintiff's family members by sponsoring mandatory minimum sentencing laws which destroyed the innocent lives of the plaintiff's family and the Negro race. The Church accepted domestic slavery as law of the United States which is consistent with Pope Gregory XVI in 1839 who approved unanimously of domestic slavery which he says was not incompatible with natural law, and that if the title was just, then the slavery was lawful "in the eye of Heaven." Pope Paul III in 1537 issued Pastoral Officium, promoted the dignity of the native peoples of the Americas: their freedom, their right to property. Pope Gregory XVI reiterates the common Catholic teachings, In Supremo, unanimously accepting slavery in the Southern States. Clement VIII in 1605 records of negro sales are being held by the religious orders and missionaries. In 1633 Urban VIII a distinction was introduced on order to answer the objection that God can have absolute ownership over the personality of a slave. Vincent Fillicius a Jesuit theologian introduces the distinction between owning the person, chattel-slavery, and owning the right to the person's labor; as well as the right to all they produce, including their offspring of the slave-woman the plaintiff race. The difference between a chattel-slavery which is morally unjust and an ameliorated slavery which is morally legitimate is a common thinking of the Vatican Council. Ameliorated in theology is defined as "alienation", slavery for a Christian master or Joe Biden, merely owns the right of use over his slave is morally legitimate because the slaves alienate their work and activity into the ownership of their master, who in this way is able to "use" the bodies and limbs of his slave for his own benefit, slavery is morally legitimate. Joe Biden, Head Ku Klux Klan, and President of the United States moral theological teachings are consistent with Vincent Fillicius a Jesuit theologian. Joe's Christian philosophical distinctions bringing the plaintiff race and the plaintiff into chattel-slavery was in 2007 S.2237 Crime Control and Prevention Act, 1990 Crime Control Act, S.3180 A bill to amend term of imprisonment, 1991 Amends the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1991, 1994 The Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act, 1986 The Anti-Drug Abuse Act. The 1994 bill interacted with and reinforced an existing and highly problematic piece of legislation: The Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1986, which created huge disparities in

sentencing between crack and powder cocaine. Under this Joe's bill, the plaintiff's Negro race is sentenced to a five-year minimum sentence for five grams of crack cocaine, but for a white person it takes 500 grams of powder cocaine to trigger the same sentence.

Conclusion

King Eduard was the first son and successor of king John I of Portugal. He was the 11th king of Portugal and the 2nd Mayor of the city Ceuta. As king, he pursued with vigor the expansion politics of his late father in Africa and as a result of this, he heavily supported the military expeditions of his brother Prince Henry the Navigator and his military Order of Christ in Africa with a numerous number of Royal Charters and Letters which encouraged the Prince to secure more territories in Africa and beyond for the kingdom of Portugal. On the 26th day of September, in the same year (1433) Prince Henry the Navigator the right to own (as a life-long property) as well as to govern the islands of the Atlantic Coasts of West Africa which Prince Henry and his military Order of Christ. Furthermore, a Royal letter granted Prince Henry the right and power to receive tax payments from those who might settle in the said islands or make trade businesses with the inhabitants of the said islands and other regions of Africa in future. These rights were clearly spelt out in the following words:

We wish to assure the said Prince Henry that he is empowered to rent the lands partly or wholly to all those who in his lifetime would come to dwell in the said islands, with the hope that they will also continue to make payment for the lands even after the death of the said Prince Henry. Moreover, we wish to issue the following guidelines for the occupation of the islands: if the said Prince Henry rents the land to someone, then let it really belong to him, if the favored person dies, the land will belong to his children, provided that they will pay the dues according to the dictates of the rentage agreement. However, it remains our exclusive right to ensure that the said Prince Henry does not permit the printing of a different currency for usage in the said islands, we want instead, that our currency remains the permitted currency in use in these islands. We are sending him this letter with our great support and assurance, it was signed by us and stamped with our lead-seal by Dante in the city of Sintra on the 26th day of September. The king granted permission to write this letter and Affonso Cotrim wrote it in the year of the Lord 1433.

Here SB1236 assures the illegal immigrants are authorized to work and guaranteed a pay with union status and "under color of law" backing as SB1236 is a work contract and here SB1236 is ensuring that federal funds are not properly spent is a

legitimate because illegal immigrants are codified legislatively as minorities and people of color which denote American people but in fact the embezzlement is the deceiving language in SB1236 and SB54. The Court is aware the Supreme Court holdings have deferred to Congress as to the regulatory purpose of any statute absent clear proof of punitive intent. Here the issue raised with attempting to find a rational non-punitive regulatory purpose for SB1236 which there can be no purpose as, illegal immigrants cannot work in the U.S. per federal law...period. SB1236 was authored, created and supported by Kevin DeLeon, Nancy Pelosi, Gavin Newsom, Maria Elena Durazo, Eloise Gomez Reyes, Janet Napolitano, Eleni Kounalakis, Xavier Becerra, Alex Padilla, Devin Nunes and Democratic National Committee. Thus, there may be issues raised by characterizing this legislation as purely regulatory in nature. This Court will have to defer to Congress as the regulatory purpose of SB1236, which the Court can find in Hoffman Plastic Compounds, Inc. v. NLRB, 535 U.S. 137 (2002), which held, Federal immigration policy, as expressed by Congress in IRCA, Foreclosed the Board from awarding backpay to undocumented aliens who have never been legally authorized to work in the United States. With the U.S. Treasury Secretary Janet Yellen scenarios in which the Treasury would be left with insufficient remaining resources to continue to finance the operations of the U.S. Government beyond the date of her announcement which was November 11, 2021, and Nancy Pelosi making sure that illegal immigrants continue to get the "Child Tax Credit" by assuring those cost were included in raising the debt ceiling which was achieved earlier this month. Without the Court's injunction on SB1236 the Dems, and Nancy Pelosi's legislations especially the guaranteed peonage by including future illegal immigrants continue to receive \$3600 per child will make illegal immigrants millionaires through welfare. As the Court is aware the projected annual income for illegal immigrants under H.R. 1319 is \$200,000,000 a year per illegal immigrant by giving them welfare for breeding. Which makes their children American citizens and their children and so on, and so on, and so on. All this was achieved because the American Negro asked the Biden/Harris so we vote for you, you must stop the killing. The Court must hold, SB1236 is in violation of Article 1 of the Constitution as SB1236 is a law that targets the plaintiff and American Negro who are individuals and not infrastructure; therefore, SB1236 is a bill of attainder. Similarly, to California's Constitution SB1236 the federal wage laws were also authored by California Legislatures, for example H.R. 1177 U.S. Citizen Act was authored by Linda Sanchez Democrat from California's 38 District and; H.R. 1319 American Rescue Plan 2021 was authored by chick named Nancy Pelosi Democrat and; S.53 Raise the Wage Act of 2021 was cosponsored by Diane Feinstein a very old very old very old lady. These thee democrats are of course women who have chosen to create legislations that will not allow the Negro race to

procreate and therefore they are no different than the Nazi doctors accused of conducting murderous and torturous human experiments in the concentration camps somewhere I read in which Nancy Pelosi heritage took a part of and now the genocide from her heritage continues upon the American Negro race under "Build Back Better." These so-called politicians' legislations are no different than the so-Doctors or the scientist and experts of Oaksterdam University in Oakland California. Similarly, what needs to occur to Nancy Pelosi is a military tribunal and the outcome needs to be that of Nuremberg after World War II which was conducted by the United States military who need to take Kevin DeLeon, Nancy Pelosi, Gavin Newsom, Maria Elena Durazo, Eloise Gomez Reyes, Janet Napolitano, Eleni Kounalakis, Xavier Becerra, Alex Padilla, Devin Nunes and Democratic National Committee into military custody for crimes of peonage §1581 Peonage; obstructing enforcement subsection (a) Whoever holds or returns any person to a condition of peonage, or arrests any person with the intent of placing him in or returning him to a condition of peonage, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both and treason §2381 Treason, Whoever, owing allegiance to the United States, levies war against them or adheres to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort within the United States or elsewhere, is guilty of treason and shall suffer death, or shall be imprisoned not less than five years and fined under this title but not less than \$10,000; and shall be incapable of holding any office under the United States. Here at the case at bar Nancy Pelosi is the representative Nazis from various sectors of California, including law, finance, ministry, and manufacturing as partners of employees must go before American Military Tribunals, similar to that at Nuremberg. Here, the Court must indict Nancy Pelosi in its Tribunal so Nancy Pelosi can be found guilty and sentenced to death by hanging until dead. As the Court is aware after World War II and after the sentences were confirmed by the military by the International Military Tribunal the U.S. Supreme Court declined to review the case.

The plaintiff seeks from the Court the award of California's 415 pledged delegates and the additionally 79 superdelegates in this case because the DNC's 501c3 nonprofit status need to be revoked and Nancy Pelosi removed from office. Their embezzling of state taxes and federal monies as stated in these causes in this claim have cause the Democratic National Committee to earn too much income generated from unrelated activities. And has jeopardized the DNC 501(c)3 tax exempt status. The Court should hold, the IRS needs to conduct an audit concerning taxable years from 1995 to 2019 for the principle issue whether there was a DNC corporate policy to terrorize and violence upon the American people that would suggest the DNC organization exclusively for charitable purposes or whether the DNC organizational resources had been diverted for the enrichment of

the illegal immigrant community and the states in which the monies have been taken were misled and the federal government was misled while believing the tax monies and federal money was being used for the American people but instead it's a shadow government created by a non-profit the Democratic National Committee and chick named Nancy Pelosi. Supported by their employees the police who have immunity to give a foreign race of people immunity from all laws both state and federal and this is while performing their authorized duties on their capacity as a city employee. Plaintiff is aware tax-exempt organizations for normal corporate taxation or trust taxation rules apply in the same manner as with any taxable corporation trust and under these circumstances, the contributions taken in by the Democratic National Committee during this time period from 1995 to 2020 were gross income under IRC 61 and, therefore, taxable. The Democratic National Committee is a private non-profit and Nancy Pelosi made a private agreement with the entire Latin American people from several nations by offering 2.4 million plus and they get free welfare (unconstitutional DNC Assistance from the plaintiff's tax dollars) know as, California Food Assistance Program of 1997 (AB 1576), Immigration Reform and Responsibility Act 1996, California Food Assistance Program of 1997 (AB 1576), Cash Assistance Program (AB2779), Public Post-Secondary, free exemption for non-resident tuition, Employment Acceleration Act (SB 1236), California Dream Act/Scholarship Eligibility, (AB 130), California Dream Act/Student Financial Aid (AB 131), TRUST Act (AB 4), Medi-Cal Eligibility (ABX1 1 and SBX1 1), Retaliation against Immigrant Workers (AB 263), Admission to Practice Law (AB 1024), Sentencing (SB 1310), Registration for Foreign Labor Contracting (SB 477), Restoring Higher Education Access and Affordability (SB 141), Expanding Access to Professional Licenses (SB 1159), SB54, and in since 2018 the University of California Regents fought hard for immigrant rights by filing five lawsuits in federal and state courts under Regents of University of California v. DHS. At issue, This is a private agreement and one not authorized by Congress but city and state employees who have an oral and written in the form of legislation above, therefore, it's the plaintiff and the Negro races position these unconstitutional laws are business contracts offered by Nancy Pelosi therefore, the plaintiff and the Negro race have no obligation to have their tax dollars used on unenforceable contracts for work, education, healthcare and money. This is peonage, 219 U.S. 219 (1911). Justice Holmes, joined by Justice Lurton, dissented on the ground that a State was not forbidden by this Amendment from punishing a breach of contract as a crime.

The court must hold that SB1236 is unconstitutional, but they are enforceable under contract law and Nancy Pelosi is responsible to fulfill their promises which the illegal immigrants can enforce upon the DNC and Nancy Pelosi through a civil

court. The Court must look at the forum selection clauses that are common in commercial contracts because they provide certainty and predictability in the resolution of disputes, *Boss v. American Express Fin. Advisors, Inc.* 6 N.Y.3d 242, 247 (2006). The Forum selection clauses comes in two forms: mandatory and permissive. In the former, the parties are “required to bring any dispute to the designated forum,” while the latter only confers jurisdiction in the designated forum, but does not deny plaintiff his choice of forum if jurisdiction there is otherwise appropriate. *Phillips v. Audio Active Ltd.*, 494 F.3d 378, 383, 386 (2d Cir. 2007). The Court’s forums selection clauses “are prima facie valid” and are not to be set aside unless a party demonstrates that the enforcement of such would be unreasonable and unjust or that the clause is invalid because of fraud or overreaching, such that a trial in the contractual forum would be so gravely difficult and inconvenient that the challenging party would, for all practical purposes, be deprived of his or her day in court. For contractual basis for enforcement of the forum selection clauses SB1236 is a commercial contract that “provides certainty and predictability in the resolution of disputes” which is mandatory and permissive that SB1236 is authored by Nancy Pelosi to contract with work and social programs for and with literally millions of aliens within the jurisdiction of the United States. The Court must also conclude SB1236 is in violation of Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, of the Constitution empowers Congress to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among several States, and with the Indian Tribes and SB1236 is commerce as used in the construction means business and commercial exchanges in any of its forms between illegal immigrants and citizens of different states and persons from one state to another. California Constitution SB1236 is Interstate commerce, with foreign nations as it occurs between illegal immigrants in the United States and their family members as they send money between borders as thieves in the night and subjects of foreign governments corruption and, either immediately or at some stage of its progress, is extraterritorial. Commerce is embezzlement as SB1236 refers to human beings as traffic or commercial exchanges involving both the United States and Mexico. SB1236 a California Constitution is in violation of the Commerce Clause. Therefore, all California Constitutions that deal with wage for illegal immigrants are: SB1236, California Food Assistance Program of 1997 (AB 1576), Immigration Reform and Responsibility Act 1996, California Food Assistance Program of 1997 (AB 1576), Cash Assistance Program (AB2779), Public Post-Secondary, free exemption for non-resident tuition, Employment Acceleration Act (SB 1236), California Dream Act/Scholarship Eligibility, (AB 130), California

Dream Act/Student Financial Aid (AB 131), TRUST Act (AB 4), Medi-Cal Eligibility (ABX1 1 and SBX1 1), Retaliation against Immigrant Workers (AB 263), Admission to Practice Law (AB 1024), Sentencing (SB 1310), Registration for Foreign Labor Contracting (SB 477), Restoring Higher Education Access and Affordability (SB 141), Expanding Access to Professional Licenses (SB 1159) and SB54 are unconstitutional and unenforceable. Kevin DeLeon, Nancy Pelosi, Gavin Newsom, Maria Elena Durazo, Eloise Gomez Reyes, Janet Napolitano, Eleni Kounalakis, Xavier Becerra, Alex Padilla, Devin Nunes and Democratic National Committee are agents acting albeit unconstitutionally in the name of the United States possess a far greater capacity for harm than an individual trespasser exercising no authority other than their own. Accordingly, as the Court is aware, the Fourteenth Amendment operates as a limitation upon the exercise of federal power regardless of whether California in whose jurisdiction that power is exercised would prohibit or penalize the identical act if engaged in by a private citizen. The Fourteenth Amendment guarantees to citizens of the United States the absolute right to be free from unreasonable searches and seizures carried out by virtue of federal or state authority. And where federally protected rights have been violated or has been the rule from the beginning that courts will be alerted to adjust their remedies so as to grant the necessary relief. The Fourteenth Amendment does not in so many words provide for its enforcement by an award of money damages. It is well settled law that where legal rights have been invaded and a federal statute provides for a general right to sue for such invasion, federal courts may use any available remedy to make good the wrong done. The plaintiff has demonstrated an injury to the American Negro the plaintiff race consequent upon the violation by federal and state employees and agents of their Fourteenth Amendment right and they are entitled to redress their injuries through a particular remedial mechanism, which is this federal court. The Court must hold, the American Negro's in California the plaintiff race is entitled to recover money damages for any injuries they have suffered as a result of Kevin DeLeon, Nancy Pelosi, Gavin Newsom, Maria Elena Durazo, Eloise Gomez Reyes, Janet Napolitano, Eleni Kounalakis, Xavier Becerra, Alex Padilla, Devin Nunes and Democratic National Committee agents of the U.S. who violated their Fourteenth Amendment rights. California Constitution SB1236 is the compliant before this Court and reflects that the American Negro the plaintiff's race are likely to succeed on the merits. The harm to the American Negro the moving party if relief is not granted and the likelihood of the American Negro the moving party success is that the Constitution protects their privileges and immunities as they are American Citizen of the United States,

as distinguished from illegal immigrants who are residents of the States and the object of the Fourteenth Amendment is undoubtably to enforce the absolute equity of the American Negro race before the law and why this injunction favors the respective parties and that the American Negro the plaintiff's race is likely to suffer irreparable harm in the absence of this preliminary relief.

The Court must hold, on March 2, 1867, in the Thirty-Ninth Congress Chap. CLXXXVIL An Act to abolish and forever prohibit the system of Peonage on the Territory New Mexico and other parts of the United States was established. Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled that the holding of any person to service or labor under the system known as peonage is hereby declared to be unlawful, and the same is hereby abolished and forever declared in the Territory of New Mexico, or of any other Territory or State of the United States, which have heretofore established, maintained or enforced or by virtue of which any attempt shall hereafter be made to establish, maintain, or enforce, directly or indirectly, the voluntary or involuntary service or labor of any person as peons, in liquidation of any debt or obligation, or otherwise, be and the same are hereby, declared null and void, and any person or persons who shall hold, arrest, or returned, or in manner aid in the arrest or return of any person or persons to be condition of peonage, shall upon conviction, be punished by fine not less than one thousand nor more than five thousand dollars, or by imprisonment not less than one nor more than five years, or both, at the direction of the court. Sec. 2. And be it further enacted. That it shall be the duty of all persons in the military or civil service in the Territory of New Mexico to aid in the enforcement of the foregoing section of this act; and any person or persons who shall obstruct or attempt to obstruct, or in any way interfere with, or prevent the enforcement of this act, shall be liable to the pains and penalties hereby provided; and any officer or other person in the military service of the United States who shall so offend, directly or indirectly, shall on conviction before a court-martial, be dishonorably dismissed the service of the United States, and shall therefore be ineligible to reappointment to any office of trust, honor, or profit under the government. What was established into law on March 2, 1867, the Thirty-Ninth Congress Chap. CLXXXVIL An Act to abolish and forever prohibit the system of Peonage on the territory the United States and other parts will never change the system of peonage prohibited.

California Constitution SB1236 is peonage and is violation of the peonage Act of 1867 attempted to outlaw peonage based on Congress' enforcement powers under the Thirteenth Amendment. Therefore SB1236 is in violation of the American Negro's the plaintiff race Thirteenth Amendment Right and nevertheless this

Court is asked to define in 2021 a California Constitution that segregates and restricts employment by nationality during Reconstruction in 2021 known as "Build Back Better", in which city and state employees have created state and federal laws to make American who were one former slaves back to effectively re-enslaved through state and federal laws by city and state employees a corrupt system by legislative Americans who created peonage a system of Jim Crow known as SB1236 a California Constitution. The institution of peonage in California Constitution SB1236 is overlapped with institution of peonage in California Constitution in DACA clearly both California laws segregate. Notwithstanding the 1867 Anti-Peonage Act, the defendant city and state employees have found ways to retain peonage restrictions without incurring technical violations of federal law until now, including "criminal surety statutes" that allowed employers to pay court fines for indigent "employees" charged with minor offenses in exchange for a commitment to pay off the debt. California Constitution SB1236 provides tax revenue for local government and a lucrative source of income for corrupt Cal-PERS officials and partners and vendors of the State of California. Examples of workers' "debt records" being subsequently "created" and paying illegal immigrants for not working and paying illegal immigrants to procreate. Kevin DeLeon, Nancy Pelosi, Gavin Newsom, Maria Elena Durazo, Eloise Gomez Reyes, Janet Napolitano, Eleni Kounalakis, Xavier Becerra, Alex Padilla, Devin Nunes and Democratic National Committee are "employers" to the millions of illegal immigrants from Mexico and Central America and when they authored surety contracts and have been systematically extended starting in 1994 to 2021 the unspecified "breaches" by witting workers, is the legal issue and financial problem for Kevin DeLeon, Nancy Pelosi, Gavin Newsom, Maria Elena Durazo, Eloise Gomez Reyes, Janet Napolitano, Eleni Kounalakis, Xavier Becerra, Alex Padilla, Devin Nunes and Democratic National Committee. Not the American people, they invited all these illegal immigrants with the Rebel Yells and there are too many to type in this document as it needs to be kept to 50 pages.

California Constitution SB1236 is peonage to the American Negro the plaintiff; race and SB1236 is a status or condition of compulsory service based upon the indebtedness of the peon, as SB1236 is written the American Negro is peon and the illegal immigrant from Mexico and Central America is the master. The service is enforced because it is a California Constitutional law and the debt will not be paid off because the American Negro voted for Proposition 187 in 1994 and these illegal immigration laws are retaliation for their vote, and however SB1236 was created, it is involuntary servitude within the prohibition of the Thirteenth Amendment to the federal Constitution. While the ordinary relation of individuals to individual are subject to the control of the states and not to that of the general

government, the Thirteenth Amendment grants to Congress power and therefore this Court that same power to enforce the prohibition against involuntary servitude, including peonage, and to punish the defendant holding the American Negro the plaintiff's race in peonage, and §§ 1990, 5526, Rev.Stat. are valid legislation under such power and operate directly on every person violating their provisions, whether in state or territory and whether there be or not any municipal ordinance or state law sanctioning such holding. Conviction cannot be had under an indictment charging defendant with returning certain persons to a condition of peonage unless there is proof that the persons so returned had actually been in such condition prior to the alleged act of returning them thereto. American's killing off American's, "Yes we Can".

Comitia Lopez
12/30/21